

❖ HEBRAICA. ❖

VOL. II.

JANUARY, 1886.

No. 2.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE REVISED VERSION TOWARD THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By PROFESSOR CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D. D.,

Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

The Revision of the so-called Authorized English Version was carried on subject to the following rule respecting the original text: 4. "That the Text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; and that when the Text so adopted differs from that from which the Authorized Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin." This rule was for the guidance of the Old Testament Company, as well as the New Testament Company. The New Testament Company gave heed to the rule, and adopted the following principles for carrying it into effect:

"A revision of the Greek text was the necessary foundation of our work; but it did not fall within our province to construct a continuous and complete Greek text. In many cases the English rendering was considered to represent correctly either of two competing readings in the Greek, and then the question of the text was usually not raised. A sufficiently laborious task remained in deciding between the rival claims of various readings which might properly affect the translation. The fourth rule. . . . was in effect an instruction to follow the authority of documentary evidence without deference to any printed text of modern times, and therefore to employ the best resources of criticism for estimating the value of evidence. . . . Many places still remain in which, for the present, it would not be safe to accept one reading to the absolute exclusion of others. In these cases we have given alternative readings in the margin, wherever they seem to be of sufficient importance or interest to deserve notice. . . .".

These principles are sound and reliable. The New Testament Company have achieved great success in working them out with conscientious care and painstaking accuracy.

We see no sufficient reasons why the same principles should not have been followed by the Old Testament Companies. A revision of the Hebrew text "was a necessary foundation of their work." They ought to have decided "between the rival claims of various readings which might properly affect the translation."

They were bound by the fourth rule, no less than the New Testament Company, "to follow the authority of documentary evidence without deference to any printed text of modern times;" and to employ "the best resources of criticism for estimating the value of the evidence."

But the Old Testament Company took another view of their duty. They say, "The task of the Revisers has been much simpler than that which the New Testament Company had before them." It has been *simpler*, because they have emptied rule 4 of its meaning. They have not regarded a revision of the Hebrew text as "the necessary foundation of their work." If they had done so, they would have found their task vastly *harder* than that of the New Testament Company. They have simplified their task by neglecting the rule under which they were appointed to make the Revision.

They did not seek a revision of the Hebrew text, but adopted the *Massoretic* text as a *Textus Receptus*. They declined to follow the authority of documentary evidence, but adopted as their foundation the same Hebrew text essentially as that upon which the Revisers of 1611 built. But they fail to tell us what they mean by *Massoretic Textus Receptus*. Ginsburg is of the opinion that "the *editio princeps* of Jacob ben Chajim's Rabbinic Bible (Venice, 1525-26)—alone is the authoritative Massoretic edition of the Hebrew Scriptures, as no reliance is to be placed on the successive reprints." If the Revisers had adopted this text as a foundation, they would have given us a definite basis; but when they inform us "with regard to the variations in the Massoretic text itself, the Revisers have endeavored to translate what appeared to them to be the best reading in the text, and where the alternative reading seemed sufficiently probable or important, they have placed it in the margin," we cannot determine whether they mean any more than the variants of the Massora of the Rabbinical Bibles, or whether they mean the variants in the Hebrew manuscripts. They make no reference to documentary authorities in dealing with the Massoretic text; and they give the impression, from their statement and from their work, that they did not seek even a revised Massoretic text. It is well known that the Massoretic text needs thorough revision. Ginsburg has not yet completed his monumental work of collecting and digesting the Massoretic material. He tells us:

"Of all the MSS. which I have collated for the last twenty years for a new edition of the Massorah, and a correct Massoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, I have not found two alike, containing exactly the same Massorah... My experience has shown me that each scribe has selected a larger or smaller quantity of Massoretic materials for the MS. he annotated, corresponding to the sum which he got for doing the work... to edit the Massorah and to compile a glossary of its technicalities, it is absolutely necessary to collate all the accessible biblical MSS."

Baer's revision of the Massoretic text is still far from completion, and far from satisfactory. The Babylonian Codex has been used by him only in part, and other ancient Hebrew MSS. still remain uncollated.

If the Revisers had considered a revised Massoretic text as "the necessary foundation of their work" and had decided between the rival claims of various readings, following the authority of documentary evidence so far as their work of translation required it, after the example of the New Testament Company, they would have rendered an invaluable service to the Christian world. But it appears that they neglected to do even this. They tell us, "The Massoretic text of the Old Testament Scriptures has come down to us in MSS. which are of no very great antiquity, and which all belong to the same family or recension;" and yet they appear not to have weighed the documentary evidence of these MSS., and to have failed to secure a correct Massoretic text of this one recension. They have taken into consideration certain variants in the Massoretic text; but they do not tell us of any standard by which these variants were measured, or of the extent to which the consideration of the variants was carried.

What, then, has the Revision accomplished for the Textual criticism of the Old Testament?

"The Revisers have thought it most prudent to adopt the Massoretic text as the basis of their work, and to depart from it, as the Authorized Translators had done, only in exceptional cases." The Textual criticism is therefore confined to exceptional cases. But in these exceptional cases there is great difference of opinion among the Revisers.

"In some few instances of extreme difficulty a reading has been adopted on the authority of the Ancient Versions, and the departure from the Massoretic text recorded in the margin. In other cases, where the versions appeared to supply a very probable though not so necessary a correction of the text, the text has been left and the variation indicated in the margin only."

The margin contains the greater number of departures from the Massoretic text. The version itself contains very few of them. The American Revisers, however, in their Appendix, assume a different attitude when they say, "Omit from the margin all renderings from the LXX., Vulgate, and other Ancient Versions or 'authorities'," and take exception to several of the very few departures from the Massoretic text contained in the Revision. Dr. Chambers, a member of the American company, defends this attitude on the ground that—

"All these references had in them too much of the uncertain, conjectural and arbitrary, to be entitled to a place in the margin, as if they had some portion of intrinsic authority. We are not sure, in any case, that the makers of these versions did not follow their own notion of what the text ought to be, rather than that which they found in the codices before them. And conjectural emendations are of no value."

Dr. Green, the chairman of the American Old Testament Company, after magnifying the difficulties in the way of the Textual criticism of the Old Testament, and showing how little has been accomplished, says:

"In this condition of affairs, the American Company felt that the best thing to do, in relation to the text, was to do nothing. When competent scholars shall have fully elaborated the problem before them, we shall be prepared to accept their results, so far as they are satisfactorily established. But until they have made it clear that we can, with safety and advantage, depart from the text traditionally preserved with such marvelous care and accuracy, we shall adhere to it as, for the present at least, the best that is attainable, getting along with its hard places as well as we can, and never setting it aside unless from imperative necessity."

We thus have clearly before us three attitudes represented in the Old Testament Company with reference to departures from the Massoretic text: (1) The margin represents the opinion of the more advanced scholars that the Ancient Versions should be used, with some measure of freedom, to ascertain the original Hebrew text; (2) The Revision represents the official opinion of the English Company that, in "instances of extreme difficulty," a reading should be adopted from the Ancient Versions; (3) The American Revisers object to all reference to the Ancient Versions as authorities, and will depart from the Massoretic text only "from imperative necessity."

We shall rise from the consideration of what has been done, to an apprehension of what ought to have been done.

The Massoretic text has the three constituent parts,—consonant text, text pointed with vowels, and accented text. We shall consider these in the reversed order.

(1) The Massoretic system of accentuation was devised partly for the division of the sentences into sections in accordance with the sense, but chiefly for cantillation in the synagogues. There are three distinct systems: (1) The Babylonian, as presented in the most ancient Hebrew MSS. now at St. Petersburg, which give the same system of accents to all the Old Testament Books; (2) The Palestinian system, which is more elaborate and artificial, and which was used for all the books except Psalms, Job and Proverbs; (3) The Palestinian Poetic system, which is more concise, but still more artificial; it is confined to the three books, Psalms, Job and Proverbs. An order of development is shown, in passing from the Babylonian points through the Palestinian prose system to the Palestinian poetic system. But even the Babylonian system shows traces of a long previous development, which was based upon the system of cantillation in the Syriac churches.

"The introduction of these musical signs was, in all probability, simultaneous with that of the vowel signs—an improvement in which, too, the Syrians had led the way. The one notation fixed the traditional *pronunciation* of each word, the other its traditional *modulation*. The two together furnished the needful direction to the Reader for the correct recitation of the sacred text" (Wickes, p. 2).

The earliest MSS. certainly known to us have the Babylonian system. If we had still earlier MSS., we might have a still earlier and simpler system. If

we should go back to the MSS. upon which the Ancient Versions were based, we would find no accents whatever, except the simple divisions such as are to be seen in the Samaritan codex. The English Company, in their Massoretic text, adopt the Palestinian system of accentuation which is found in the Rabbinical Bibles and in the printed editions generally, except in the Complutensian Polyglott.

(a) The American Revisers differ from the English Revisers in Dan. ix., 25. The English Revisers follow the Massoretic accents, and read, "Unto the anointed one, the prince, shall be seven weeks: and three-score and two weeks, it shall be built again," etc. The American Revisers disregard the accents, and read, "Seven weeks, and three-score weeks and two weeks: it shall be," etc. Dr. Green (in *Presbyterian Journal*, June 25) says:

"The most serious alteration, to my mind, in the entire Old Testament, is the famous passage of the seventy weeks, in Dan., ch. ix. . . . Instead of the semi-colon after threescore and two weeks, the text of the Revision punctuates after seven weeks. This is in accordance with the Massoretic interpunction, which, however, in so difficult a prophecy, need not be decisive. It absolutely closes the door to the Messianic interpretation," etc.

This, then, is what Dr. Green regards as an "imperative necessity." The necessity springs from the desire to preserve the "Messianic interpretation." It is not a necessity of documentary evidence, or of the authority of Versions, but purely internal evidence which is offered for the departure from the Massoretic text,—and this of a somewhat slender kind.

Moreover, this change is not necessary for the preservation of the Messianic interpretation. Keil, Kleifoth, and others, adhere to the accents, and yet are firm in their Messianic interpretation. One fails to see any "imperative necessity" for a departure from the text here, such as would be recognized either by the science of Textual criticism, or the rules of Hermeneutics.

Textual criticism has its well defined laws. The three great principles, well nigh universally admitted, are, (1) The reading which lies at the root of all the variations, and best explains them, is to be preferred; (2) The most difficult reading is more likely to be correct; (3) The reading most in accordance with the context, and especially with the style and usage of the author and his times, is to be preferred. These principles were employed by the New Testament Company. Why were they not employed by the Old Testament Company? There is nothing capricious about them. They are well tried, and lead to positive and solid results.

(b) In the matter of the accents, the Revisers do not always follow the documentary authority of the Hebrew manuscripts. They render Ps. xix., 13:

"Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins;
Let them not have dominion over me: then shall I be perfect,
And I shall be clear from great transgression."

The best MSS. divide verse 13 at **בִּי** by the 'Olèv'jored. The documentary evidence is supported by the internal evidence of the parallelism, which had already influenced Ewald, Hitzig, Bickell, Ley, and others, to arrange—

גַּם-מִזְדִּים חֶשֶׁךְ עֶבֶרְךָ אֶל-יִמְשְׁלוּ בִּי
אִזּוּ אִתָּם וְנִקִּיתִי מִפֶּשַׁע רֶב*

(c) In Isa. LIV., 9, the current Palestinian accentuation is **כִּי-מִי נַח** (so Baer). But the Babylonian Codex and other Hebrew MSS. read **כִּימִי נַח**; and these are sustained by the Peshitto, Targum, Vulgate and Saadia. The LXX. reads **כִּימִי**, which can best be explained as a corruption of **כִּימִי**, as Delitzsch shows. The passage, Matt. xxiv., 37, also points in the same direction. The external evidence is unusually strong; for it is varied, extensive and harmonious. **כִּימִי** has the strongest documentary evidence, and is at the root of all the readings, and best explains them all. It is also the more difficult reading; for the scribe would naturally write **נַח מִי**, in accordance with the next clause. The correct Massoretic text is therefore **כִּימִי נַח זֹאת לִי**, and the translation should be, "As the days of Noah is this time, when I swear that the waters of the flood should no more go over the earth, so I swear that I will not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee." The *margin* of the R. V. gives it correctly, but the R. V. itself neglects the documentary evidence in its favor, and the American Revisers would blot the correct reading from the margin.

(d) The Revisers do not correct the Massoretic accents by the Ancient Versions. The Ancient Versions were all made from unaccented MSS. Their readings must be explained. They can be explained only by blotting out the accents from the original text, and then determining, on the principles of Textual criticism, what is the proper divisions of the verses. If this first principle of the Textual criticism of the Old Testament had been followed, and the third law of intrinsic probability had been obeyed, who can doubt that the refrain of Ps. XLII., 5, would have been given correctly? The Massoretic text points: **יִשׁוּעַת פָּנָיו; אֱלֹהֵי יִשׁוּעַת פָּנָי וְאֱלֹהֵי**.⁶ but the original text was certainly **יִשׁוּעַת פָּנָי וְאֱלֹהֵי יִשׁוּעַת פָּנָיו**.

Here again the margin gives the correction; the R. V. itself does not obey the laws of Textual criticism, but adheres to the Massoretic text in spite of them; and the American Revisers would remove the correct reading from the margin.

(e) The chief mistakes of the points are in the parallelism of Hebrew Poetry. We have already given a number of examples of this in the *Presbyterian Review* (July, '85). We shall confine ourselves here to a single example.

Psalm CXLIV. is made up of two distinct psalms. It is noteworthy that the Revisers give a space between the two pieces, after verse 11. The difference is more distinct in Hebrew, owing to the rhythmical movement; verses 1-11 are trim-

* We insert the Maqqe'phs in accordance with the requirements of the rhythm, here and elsewhere, and disregard the Maqqe'phs of the Massoretic system, which were employed for purposes of cantillation. The lines are pentameters, composed of 3+2, or 2+3 accented words.

eters, but verses 12-15 are pentameters. The parallelisms of the Revisers show the increased length of the lines in verses 12, 13; but in verses 14, 15 they are misled by the accents, and miss the rhythm. Cheyne (*Book of Psalms*, 1884) recognizes the movement, and also sees that the Massoretic text is corrupt in the last half of the fifth line. We venture to insert the rare word צן, of Job v., 5, and Prov. xxii., 5, "thorn-hedge," and with the suffix צנינו after פרץ. The LXX. implies some such word by its rendering κατάπτωμα φραγμού. Any one can see how easy it would be for a copyist to leave out צן or צונו between פרץ and ואין, especially in rapid reading aloud. It is also our opinion that ש' (שכבה) is a representative of an older אשר used in the poem. The Revisers make the last four lines into five, thus:

"When our oxen are well laden (two words);
When there is no breaking in, and no going forth (three words),
And no outcry in our streets (three words);
Happy is the people, that is in such a case (four words):
Yea, happy is the people, whose God is the Lord (four words)."

The arrangement should be,

אשר בנינו כנטעים מגדלים כנעוריהם
בנותינו כזויות מחטבות תבנית היכל
מוזינו מלאים מפיקים מון אל-זן
צאננו מאליפות מרכבות בחוצותינו
אלופינו מסבלים אין פרץ (צנינו)
ואין יוצאת ואין צוחה כרחבתנו
אשרי העם אשר כבה לו
אשרי העם אשר יהוה אלהיו

We would translate:

"When our sons are as plants,—grown up in their youth;
Our daughters as corner-stones,—hewn after the fashion of a palace;
Our garners full,—affording all manner of store;
Our sheep bringing forth thousands—ten thousands in our fields;
Our kine great with young;—there is no breaking in through our thorn-hedges;
And there is no going forth to war,—and no cry of alarm in our streets;
Happy the people,—when it is so to them:
Happy the people—when Jahveh is their god."

(2) The vowel points do not belong to the original text. There are two systems,—the Babylonian and Palestinian, both represented in the MSS. now accessible to Hebrew scholars. They go back upon an earlier and simpler system, like the Arabic and Syriac. The chief Ancient Versions were made from texts without vowel points. The principles of Textual criticism require us, therefore, to build on a text without the points.

(a) The American Revisers agree to the change of points of בארי, Ps. xxii., for they acknowledge that "the Hebrew text, as pointed, reads, like a lion," and yet they

propose to strike from the margin the "Sept., Vulg. and Syr.," which support the reading they have adopted. The change of points is sustained by the Versions, but not by documentary authority of Hebrew MSS. The Complutensian text, and a few others, read כָּאֵר. But the ' best accounts for all the facts of the case, and the word, by different points, is capable of the two interpretations. But we cannot see that there is here any "imperative necessity" to depart from the Massoretic points, or even an instance of "extreme difficulty." It is indeed nothing more than "a very probable" correction of the text, such as the English Revisers tell us they would place in the margin.

(b) The American Revisers also consent to the change of the construct מִדְּבָר into the absolute מִדְּבָר, in Ps. LXXV., 6, in order to get the rendering of the R. V. "Nor yet from the south cometh lifting up." The margin is "Or, *from the wilderness of mountains, cometh judgment.*" There is the documentary evidence of 50 MSS. and Kimchi, for this change; Baer follows them in his text of the Psalms, but the Massoretic MSS. are decidedly for מִדְּבָר. The LXX., Vulg. and Symm. give "wilderness of mountains," and are against the change. It was more natural for the scribe to point with Qāmēç here, as in the two previous words; the construct is the more difficult reading. Two of the three laws of Textual criticism count against the change. Intrinsic probability is rather in its favor. There is no necessity, however, in this case for departing from the A. V., and the Revisers, according to their principles, ought not to have made the change. Cheyne, and De Witt, two of the Revisers, rightly adhere to the Massoretic text, in their versions.

(c) In Hos. VII., 5, the R. V. gives "the princes *made themselves sick* with the heat of wine;" the margin "According to many ancient versions *began to be heated with wine.*" The difference is in the pointing. הִחֲלִי or הִחֲלִי. Hitzig rightly says upon this passage, "Since all the ancient versions read הִחֲלִי, and the passage VIII., 10 is a close parallel, we reject the Jewish points, whose sense in other respects is not suited to the context." The margin and the text ought to have changed places. If, now, we turn to VIII., 10, we find that the Revisers reject the A. V. "shall sorrow a little," and placed it in the margin, and render "begin to be minished." In order to this, they follow the usual Massoretic וַיִּחֲלִי, (we presume), although they render it as ׀ consecutive of perfect, and they take מַעַט as an infinitive. But the Codices Bab. and Erfurt 3 read וַיִּחֲלִי, and this imperfect with weak waw is sustained by LXX., Symm., Theod., Vulg., and is best suited to the syntactical construction of the context, and מַעַט is an adverb. If we render the verb "begin," and מַעַט as an adverb, it is necessary to regard the clause as pregnant, and supply a verb. None more suitable can be found than those supplied by the LXX. κοπάσονται, and Vulg. *quiescent*.

(d) But there are very many passages in which internal evidence calls for a change in the pointing. Thus Ps. L. is a beautiful pentameter of three strophes.

The first strophe has eight lines, verses 1-6; the second, ten lines, verses 7-15; the third, ten lines, verses 16-23. If, now, we examine the second strophe, we find it to be throughout an address to the people of God, with a concluding exhortation in two lines,

זבח * (לאֱלֹהִים) תּוֹרָה וּשְׁלָם לַעֲלִיּוֹן נִרְרִיךְ
וּקְרָאנִי בְיוֹם צָרָה אֲחַלְצֶךָ וְתִכְבְּרֵנִי

The third strophe is an address to the wicked, with a concluding warning,

פֶּן אֲטַרְף וְאִין-מִצִּיל זִבַּח תּוֹרָה
יִכְבְּרֵנִי וּשְׁם-דֶּרֶךְ אֲרָאנוּ בִישַׁע אֱלֹהִים

The Massoretic text points זבח here as a participle, and divides the verse at יִכְבְּרֵנִי. It also gives the clause with פֶּן in the previous verse. If, now, we point זבח as imperative, we find that the wicked, as well as the people of God, are exhorted to offer a thank-offering; and if we make the second line begin with יִכְבְּרֵנִי, the wicked are exhorted to glorify God, as the righteous had been in the second line which closed the previous strophe. We see, then, that the exhortation is urged in the first line by a warning which reminds us of Ps. II., 12, and in the second line, in the introverted parallelism, by a promise which goes back upon the promise of the closing line of the previous strophe. It seems, then, that we have here two forms of a refrain, which marks the close of the two strophes, and it would appear that the first strophe is just two lines short, on account of the absence of this refrain, which has been omitted, as frequently elsewhere in the Psalter. Cf. Ps. XLVI., 3.

(3) The original Hebrew text, upon which the Ancient Versions were based, and which is the essential thing to be determined in Textual criticism, was altogether without points. It was a consonant text. But even this needs to be determined by a thorough revision of the Massoretic K'thîbh, by a careful study of MSS., the Massora, the Ancient Versions, and citations, and the conditions of the text itself. The rules of external and internal evidence should be applied with scientific accuracy and precision.

(a) The American Revisers agree to the change of the consonants אכל into אבן, in 1 Sam. VI., 18, as Dr. Chambers says, "one of the few instances in which the existing Hebrew text is corrected, on the authority of the Early Versions, the internal evidence in their favor being overwhelming." Here Dr. Chambers seems to use the internal evidence to strengthen the external evidence of the Versions. But he has said that "*conjectural emendation is worthless*," and that the Versions are of uncertain authority. How can two such weak reasons make a strong one? But there are other examples of departure from the Massoretic text which the American Revisers allow.

* This divine name is probably a prosaic addition. It is quite frequent, in Hebrew Poetry, that divine names are inserted, against the original rhythm.

(b) In Isa. ix., 2, they follow the Q^ri לִי, and reject the K^thîbh לֹא. The Bab. Codex agrees with the western codices here. The Peshitto, Targum and Saadia agree with the Q^ri; but Symmachus and the Vulgate are with the K^thîbh. The LXX. gives it τὸ πλεῖστον τοῦ λαοῦ ὃ κατήγαγες ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ σου. The documentary evidence is in favor of the K^thîbh, and the Versions are divided. Following the example of the LXX., several modern critics change the text to הִגִּיל, as Selwyn, or הִגִּילָה, as Krochmal and Cheyne. The Q^ri is easy; but the לִי would be in an unnatural position, and apparently superfluous to the sense and the rhythm. If we render "whose joy thou didst not increase," as Hitzig, Hengst., *et al.*, we have a contrast which is in accord with viii., 23. The לֹא is the more difficult reading, and is to be preferred on that account. The three great critical principles count for לֹא. There is no such "imperative necessity" for departing from the K^thîbh as the American Revisers require. Textual Criticism sustains the K^thîbh.

There are very many textual changes which ought to have been made from better critical authority.

(c) Ps. LXVIII., 23 is given by the R. V.:

"That thou mayest dip thy foot in blood,
That the tongue of thy dogs may have its portion from *thine* enemies."

The Massoretic text is:

למען תמחין רגלך בדם
לשון כלבך מאיבים מנהו

The English Revisers change תמחין into תרחץ, and מנהו into מנתו.

The American Revisers agree to the rendering of the last line. They may have followed Perowne, in taking מנהו as a noun, מן with the archaic nominal suffix הו; but there is no lexical authority for such a word as מן = "portion." It is better to correct the text by a single letter, to get a good word, than to keep the text and forge a word. The rendering "portion" we presume comes from מנתו, which the Revisers saw to be a proper change in the text. But it is not a necessary change. The A. V. renders מנהו as preposition מן with suffix, "in the same." Some interpreters supply a verb, and render drink "of it," or "of them." External authority for the change of text, and corresponding change of rendering, is wanting. The internal evidence is probable, but not necessary. The other change of מחץ into רחץ, which the American Revisers reject, has strong evidence in its favor. Several Versions, such as LXX., Vulgate and Syriac, give external evidence for it. It is easy to explain a copyist changing רחץ into מחץ, owing to the מחץ of verse 22. Moreover, intrinsic probability is so strongly in favor of the change, that the American Revisers are forced to supply the very verb which they decline to find in the original; so that they render "crush them, dipping."

(d) Psalm viii., 1 is rendered by R. V., "Who has set thy glory upon the heavens." The American Revisers allow it to stand, and yet object to the margin "so some ancient versions," which justifies it. The Massoretic text cannot be rendered in that way. There is no documentary evidence for the change in Hebrew MSS. We must go to the Versions. These require us to change נתנה into נתתה. There is, however, an easier change of תנה into תנה, suggested by Ewald, and followed by Riehm and others, which retains the K'thibh, and only changes a single point. This commends itself to our judgment as best explaining all the facts of the case.

(e) The current Massoretic text reads in Hos. ii., 22, ידעת את יהוה. This is supported by the LXX. But the Babylonian Codex reads ידעת כי אני יהוה. This is supported by the Vulgate "quia ego Dominus." The authority of the documents and the Versions is divided. Cheyne refers to the usage of Hosea elsewhere as an internal evidence in favor of the common text; but it seems to us that the context of chap. ii. is decisive for יהוה כי אני, on account of the contrast between בעלי and אשי, and the removal of the name בעל as a lawful name of Israel's God, in order to the use of יהוה.

(f) The Massoretic text of Hos. v., 11, is הלך אחרי צו; but the LXX. and Peshitto read שוא. This better reading is mentioned in the margin. The omission of the א was an easy scribal error, in the unaccented text, which read אחרי שוא ואני. The omission of the א would force the change of ש to צ.

(g) Psalm xxxii., 5, is somewhat difficult of construction. The difficulty is removed if, with Hupfeld, we transfer אמרתי from the second line to the first line of the verse, and read,

אמרתי חטאתי אודיעך ועוני לא-כסיתי
אודה עלי-פשעי ליהוה ואתה-נשאת עון-חטאתי

The Revisers ignore the difficulty by rendering the imperfect אודיעך "I acknowledged," which is contrary to good grammar as well as to the parallel אודה, which they render "I will confess." The אמרתי must be supplied in sense, in order to translate correctly.

(h) Psalm lxxii. is composed of three strophes. The strophes begin with imperatives or jussives, e. g., תן, verse 1; וירך, verse 8; ויהי, verse 15; which then pass over into future indicatives, e. g., 1-7, 8-14, 15-17. These jussives are ignored in the Revised Version, where they are all rendered as futures. The margin proposes to ignore the indicatives, and translate all as jussives, ignoring the difference in form. The strophes are uniform, save that the middle one has an extra line. When we compare the line

כי יציל אביון משוע ועני ואין עזר לו

with Job xxix., 12, כי אמלט עני משוע ויתום ולא עזר לו,

we see that it is a free reproduction of it. The clause with כי is different from

all the other clauses of the previous and the subsequent context, which are all clauses of direct statement in future indicatives in progressive parallelism. We cannot escape the conclusion that the line has come into the text from a marginal note, and that it should be stricken out.

(i) Ezekiel **xxi.**, 31, is rendered by the A. V., "Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this *shall not be* the same: exalt *him that is low*, and abase *him that is high*." The R. V. substitutes "mitre" for "diadem," "*be no more the same*" for "*not be the same*," "exalt *that*" for "exalt *him*," and "abase *that*" for "abase *him*." The R. V. gives in the margin "I will remove," etc., for "Remove," etc., and "Heb., not this" for "no more the same." The American Revisers do not object to the R. V.

The Massoretic text gives three infinitive constructs, **הָרִים**, **הָסִיר**, and **הַשְׁפִּיל**, and one infinitive absolute **הִזְכִּחַ**. The A. V., R. V., margin of R. V. and American Revisers all follow the Versions against the Massoretic text, and point these four forms alike as infinitive absolutes. The text renders the infinitive absolutes as imperatives, the margin as first person of imperfect; either of which is correct if the forms be really infinitive absolutes. There is a clear inconsistency here between the one infinitive absolute and the three infinitive constructs, but the textual principle of consistency requires that we should correct the one infinitive absolute after the three infinitive constructs, rather than the reverse. Hence Ewald renders:

"Zu entfernen ist der Kopfbund und wegzunehmen die Krone! das ist nicht das! das Niedrige ist zu erhöhen und das Hohe zu erniedrigen!"

There is certainly here no "imperative necessity" or any "extreme difficulty," to require a departure from the Massoretic text and a following of the Versions. Ewald is here stricter in his adherence to conservative critical principles than the Revisers.

Furthermore, we are constrained to inquire why the Revisers did not give the "that" of the clause "exalt that which is low" in italics, in order to show that this word was not in the text, and that it was of the nature of an interpretation. The A. V. is more careful here; for although they interpret differently, they give their interpretation in italics, and render "*him that is low*" and "*him that is high*." The same objection may fairly be taken to the rendering "This *shall be no more the same*," as against the more careful A. V., "this *shall not be the same*." "No more" is an interpretation. The Hebrew gives simply the negative **לֹא**, as the margin "Hebrew, not this."

The R. V. leaves the A. V. "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; this also shall be no more," in its inexactness. The margin "An overthrow, overthrow, overthrow will I make it" ought to have gone into the text. And the last clause ought to have been rendered correctly. **גַּם זֶאת לֹא הִיא** cannot be rendered "this also shall be no more." The verb is perfect and masculine, and cannot

have a feminine subject before it, or be rendered as future. The **גם זאת** belongs to the previous clause, and **לא היה** to the following. This is clear from the difference in gender.

(k) Psalm LXXXVII. is a charming little pentameter, whose movement escapes the Revisers. We shall arrange it correctly, and then arrange it as the Revisers translate. It should be arranged

יסודתו בהררי קדש אהב יהוה
שערי ציון מכל משכנות יעקב
נכבדות מדבר בכ עיר האלהים
אזכיר רחב ובבל לידעי
הנה פלישת וצור-עם-כוש זה ילד-שם
ולציון יאמר איש ואיש ילד-בה
והוא יכוננה עליון יהוה
יספר בכתוב עמים זה ילד-שם
ושרים כחללים כל מעיני בכ

This arrangement disregards the accents which separate verses 1 and 2. The margin of the Revision is correct here. We also remove יהוה from verse 6 to the close of verse 5. The Massoretic text reads **כל מעיני בכ** = "all my fountains are in thee." But the LXX. *κατοικία*, and the Vulgate *habitatio* imply a different pointing, **מעיני** = "dwellers in thee," a construct of participle **עין** to dwell.

Accordingly, we translate :

"His foundation in the holy mountains Jahveh is loving ;
The gates of Zion more than all the tabernacles of Jacob.
Glorious things are being spoken in thee, city of God.
I mention Rahab and Babylon as belonging to them that know me ;
Behold Philistia and Tyre with Ethiopia, this one was born there,—
Yea, as belonging to Zion, it is said, One and another was born in her.
And He himself establishes her—the Most High, Jahveh,
He counts, in writing up the people, This one was born there,
And singing as well as dancing are all who dwell in thee."

The Revisers arrange the Psalm :

יסודתו בהררי-קדש
אהב יהוה שערי-ציון
מכל משכנות יעקב
נכבדות מדבר בכ
עיר האלהים
אזכיר רחב ובבל לידעי
הנה פלישת וצור-עם-כוש
זה ילד-שם
ולציון יאמר איש ואיש ילד-בה
והוא יכוננה עליון

יהוה יספר בכתוב עמים
 זה ילד-שם
 ושרים כחללים
 כל מעיני כך

Any one can see that there is no poetry here.

The Revisers seem capricious in their treatment of Hebrew Poetry for (1) their arrangement of the parallel lines is not in accord with the laws of Hebrew Poetry, (2) they neglect the poetry of the prophets altogether, (3) they make the Old Testament discordant with the New Testament, for the Revisers of the New Testament Version give the parallelisms of the poetic extracts from the prophets, and at times differ from the Old Testament Company in the parallelisms, that both have given, e. g., Heb. III., 9; Mark XII., 36; Acts II., 17.

We have given a sufficient number of examples to show that the attitude of the Revised Version to the Textual criticism of the Old Testament is an inconsistent and untenable one. The Revisers appear not to have followed the well established rules of Textual criticism. They have neglected to build on a correct Hebrew text; they have not sought a correct Massoretic text; they have departed from the current Massoretic text in a few cases, but with caprice, making departures that were not necessary, according to their own restrictions, and which are not sustained by the laws of Textual criticism, and yet declining to make changes which the rules of Textual criticism imperatively demand. The Textual criticism of the Old Testament is in its infancy. It is desirable that the defects of the Revised Version, in this respect, should arouse Hebrew scholars and the general Christian public to a realization of what needs to be done, and to an earnest resolve and an enthusiastic endeavor to accomplish the work. A Christian Bible-loving people will never be satisfied with a version which does not rest upon a thoroughly revised and carefully sifted Hebrew text.

SIPPARA.

BY REV. WILLIAM HAYES WARD, D. D., LL. D.,

Editor New York *Independent*.

Sippara is known in Scripture as Sepharvaim. We are told that it was one of those cities whose inhabitants, with those of Cuthah (supposed to be Tel Ibrahim), Avva (or Ivvah, locality unknown), and Hamath, were carried to Samaria to replace the children of Israel carried captive in the reign of Hoshea (2 Kgs. xvii., 24). The Sepharvites, we are told, burned their sons in worship of their gods Adrammelech and Anammelech (2 Kgs. xvii., 31). The Rab-shakeh of King Sennacherib, sent by him to Jerusalem from Lachish, mentions Hamath and Arpad, and then Sepharvaim, Hena and Ivvah, as cities which could not withstand the royal armies (2 Kgs. xviii., 34; Isa. xxxvi., 19, where Hena and Ivvah are omitted); and a little later the king sends a letter to Hezekiah in which these towns are mentioned in the same order (2 Kgs. xix., 13; Isa. xxxvii., 13).

In the Fragments of Berosus, Sippara is also called Sispara, Sippbara, and Pantabibla, the latter name being an obvious but incorrect translation of the Semitic name of the city. Of the ten kings before the Flood, he says that five (Euseb., *Armen. Chron.*, p. 5, ed. Mai) were from Pantabibla, preceded by two from Babylon, and followed by three from Larancha. As quoted in Syncellus (p. 39 B) four of these kings were from Pantabibla (so also Syncellus quotes Berosus from Abydenus, p. 38 B).

Syncellus (p. 30 A) and Eusebius (*Armen. Chron.*, p. 14, ed. Mai) report Berosus as saying that before the Flood Kronos commanded Xisuthrus to bury in "Sippara, the city of the Sun" (no longer Pantabibla) the record of all things, beginning, middle and end; and further, that after the Flood, when his ship had settled on one of the Cordyæan mountains of Armenia, he was bidden by the god to dig up these records, which was done when he went south to Babylon. The same legend, quoted through Abydenus, is told more briefly elsewhere (Syncellus, p. 38 D; Euseb. *Armen. Chron.*, p. 22, ed. Mai), Sippara being also called Heliopolis, or the City of the Sun.

In Ptolemy (V. 18, 7) the form Sippbara is given, and it is one of the few towns of the twenty-two on the Euphrates which are easily recognized. The same town is probably designated as Hipparenum in Pliny's Natural History (VI. p. 691, ed. Franz, 1778). He says that in Mesopotamia the city of Hipparenum is famous for the learning of the Chaldees, and is near the canal Narraga, and that its walls were thrown down by the Persians. He mentions Babylon and Orchœ (Warka, Erech), farther south, as the other seats of Chaldean learning.

It would be interesting and important, did space permit, to trace the town in the later literature of Zosimus, Ammian, the Talmud of Babylon, Abulfeda, Benjamin of Tudela, and others. It bore different names, and it is a task of difficulty to disentangle these names, and those of the Royal Canal, Nahar-malka, at whose exit from the Euphrates it lay. Apparently the name Hipparenum, or Harpanya, was transferred to a spot north of the canal, now called Sufeireh, and Sippara took the names of Persebora, Firuz-Sabor, Shabor, and Anbar or Ambar. Persebora is called by Zosimus the largest city in Assyria, after Ctesiphon, which had 600,000 inhabitants.

In the Talmud, which contains a mine of information about Babylonian geography, yet but imperfectly worked, Sippara seems to be mentioned under several names. Neubauer, *Geog. de Talmud*, p. 340, shows that the Talmudic city of Nehardaa, was at the junction of the Nahar Malka, or Royal Canal, and the Euphrates, and on the south bank of the canal, which he identifies with the present Nahr Isa. Nehardaa is the same, he shows, with the Naarda of Ptolemy, and the Naharra of the Peutingerian Tables, and also identical with, or close to Hipparenum, which was also at the point of departure of the Nahar Malka from the Euphrates. Nehardaa was one of the chief places of Babylonia, and one of the districts was named after it (Neub., p. 342). This was the most ancient Jewish community in Babylonia. From Nehardaa the Jews sent their alms to Jerusalem, and here they found a refuge from persecution.

We now turn to the Assyrian inscriptions to learn what they can tell us about this once famous city. Its Akkadian designation was Ud-kib-nun, with the determinative sign ki added. In the Semitic Assyrian it is Sippar or Sipar. There is no likelihood that the word is derived from a root meaning "a book," notwithstanding the Greek translation of Pantabibla. Perhaps the derivation given in the four-column syllabary W. A. I., V. 23, 1, Reverse (mistake for obverse) l. 29, from *Zimbir*; the meaning of which is not easy to guess, is equally incorrect. The existence of two Sippars has long been recognized, a Sippar of Anunit, apparently identical with Agane, otherwise read *Agade* or *Akkad*, and a Sippar of Shamash, the sun-god; and these two have been regarded as two faubourgs of a single city, separated by a canal, and thus making the city double, and accounting for the Hebrew dual Sepharvaim (see Fr. Delitzsch's *Wo lag das Paradies?* pp. 209-212, for the fullest account of Sippar in cuneiform records).

Sippara is always mentioned in such a way as to indicate that it was one of the oldest and largest cities of Babylonia.

In W. A. I., II. 13, l. 26, d, a, grammatical bilingual text, the fortress of Sippar is mentioned, following the mention of the fortresses of Nipur and Babylon (cf. Lenorm. *Ehud. Accad.* 7, 3, p. 16; Oppert et Menant, *Doc. Jurid.* p. 11). This text distinctly identifies the Akkadian form Ud-kib-nun with the Semitic Sipar. In a bilingual list of towers (*ziggurat*) in Babylonia, W. A. I., II. 50, l. 8, Sippar

is mentioned, and l. 9, Agane. These are preceded by Babylon and Nipur. A bilingual tablet, W. A. I., II. 48, l. 55, a, b (Lenormant, *Etud. Accad.*, III. p. 211), mentions "the star of Sippar," following it by "the star of Nipur," and "the star of Babylon." Other passages could be quoted which indicate equally that Sippara, Babylon and Nipur were the chief towns of Akkad.

Sippara was on the Euphrates river. Indeed the Euphrates is called in a syllabary, W. A. I., V. 22, Rev. 30, 31 (Budge's *Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon*, p. 7, N.) the River of Sippar. The two lines read:

Idicnu = Nahar Bartiggar,

Puranunu = Nahar Sippar,

or "The Idicnu [Sumerian name] is the River Tigris, and the Puranunu [Euphrates] is the River of Sippara." Also a clay cylinder of Nebuchadnezzar II. W. A. I., V. 34, col. 1, l. 39 (Budge's *Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon*, p. 22), in a description of the building of the quay along the bank of the Euphrates at Babylon, calls that river "the River of Sippara."

Among the passages which distinguish the Sippar of Shamash from the Sippar of Anunit may be mentioned the Synchronistic Table, W. A. I., II. 65, 18, 19. (Lotz's *Tiglath Pileser*, pp. 200, 201; *Records of the Past*, V. p. 89; Menant's *Annales de l'Assyrie*, p. 51) where we are told that Tiglath Pileser I. (1120-1100 B. C.), in the second year of his reign, destroyed in Upper Akkad the cities of "Durkurigalzu (Akerkûf), Sippar of Shamash, Sippar of Anunit, Babylon and Upe (Opis), great cities, and their fortresses." This locates Sippara in the district which extends not much south of Babylon, and recognizes the two places of the name. Other similar passages could be cited.

The Sippara of Shamash had a temple to the sun-god called E-babbara (otherwise vocalized Bit-parra); while the temple of Anunit at the Sippara of Anunit was called E-ulbar (otherwise Bit-ulbar). We have noticed above that Berosus is quoted as calling Sippara the city of the Sun. Thus on the barrel of Nabonidus from Mugheir, W. A. I., 69, 3, l. 27, 29, 42 (Oppert, *Exped. en Mes.*, I., pp. 273-275; Menant, *Bab. et Chald.*, p. 257; Lenormant, *Berose*, pp. 293-295), we read, "E-babbara, the temple of Shamash of Sippara, and E-ulbar, the temple of Anunit of Sippar." The temple E-ulbar, built or repaired by the ancient king Sagaraktiyas, is said, *ib.*, col. 2, l. 29, to have been in Agane, and, col. 3, l. 28, to have been the temple of Anunit of Sippara. The identity of Agane with Sippara of Anunit is further indicated by W. A. I., IV. 59, 3, l. 54, where Anunit is mentioned as the goddess of Agane; and W. A. I., III. 43, 1, l. 19, where E-ulbar is mentioned in close connection with Agane (*ib.*, l. 23). Menant, *Bab. et Chald.*, p. 96, mentions a "Nahar Agane," Canal of Agane, which he supposes to flow between the Sippara of Shamash and the Sippara of Anunit, but I fail to find the text which confirms it.

Sippara appears finally in the history of the capture of Babylon from Nabon-

idus by Cyrus. In all his memorial inscriptions Nabonidus records his repairs of the temples in Sippara of Shamash and Sippara of Anunit, describing his search for the old foundations and memorial tablets of Sagaragtiburyas, and Naramsin, son of Sargon I., 3200 before, W. A. I., V. 64, col. 2. The tablet which gives the capture of Babylon by Cyrus, *Transs. Soc. Bib. Arch.*, VII. p. 158, says that on the fifth of Nisan the mother of Nabonidus "who dwelt in the fortress and camp on the Euphrates river above Sippara, died." Eight years later Sippara was captured by Cyrus "without fighting." This passage clearly indicates that Sippara was on the Euphrates. Agane is mentioned also by Cyrus in his cylinder, W.A.I., V. 35, 31, as one of the places where he restored the shrines of the gods.

From these, and other passages which might be cited, but which add little geographically, we would safely gather that Sippara was on the Euphrates river, above Babylon, near the north line of Akkad, that it was one of the very oldest and largest cities of Akkad, the seat of the earliest great conqueror Sargon, and that it continued down to the time of Cyrus to be a city of the greatest importance.

This place Mr. Rassam claims to have discovered at Abu Habba, a ruin a little to the left of the caravan road from Baghdad to Babylon and Hillah. He has carried on extensive excavations there, and found a great number of tablets bearing date at Sippar of Shamash. A large stone tablet also found there describes the repair of the temple of Shamash of Sippara. It has generally been admitted, since the discovery of these remains, that Abu Habba must be the site of Sippara.

I visited Abu Habba twice, while with the Wolfe expedition to Babylonia. It was the first tel I visited after reaching the country, and my time was limited, and my results unsatisfactory. After visiting Southern Chaldea, on my return to Baghdad, I paid it a second visit, for the purpose of discovering if it could be made to agree with the description given of Sippara in the monuments. It is a large and very important ruin, though scarcely of the first class. The walls are nearly square, perhaps seven hundred yards long, and the enclosure is divided into three principal parts by two cross walls which are not parallel to the northern and southern walls. Of these included sections only the middle, shaped nearly like the letter V, is occupied by ruins. The explorations made by order of Mr. Rassam are very extensive, having opened scores of rooms, but they are chiefly about the south-west corner, and large spaces are undug. The deepest excavation is about a large, square tower, but nothing was found there. The men who conducted the excavations for Mr. Rassam showed us all about, and pointed out the place where was found the stone with pictures of "Noah and his three sons" (the Sun-god of Sippara), and assured us that they knew, by the indications of ashes, where further tablets could be found by a day or two's digging. I looked especially to see if there was any thing to correspond to the "double city" which Sippara has been

supposed to be, but there is nothing duplex about it. It is a single faubourg in the enclosing walls, with no marked depression, or canal course dividing it. It has been supposed that the ed-Deir, distant about five miles, might be the Sippara Anunit, or Agane, while Abu Habba is the Sippara of Shamash; but ed-Deir, which I did not visit, was described to me as an unimportant ruin, where digging has failed to discover any thing. Another thing which troubled me about making any identification was the fact that Abu Habba is not on the Euphrates, but is some seven miles distant, or nearly a third of the distance which separates the Euphrates from the Tigris. It has been suggested that perhaps the Euphrates used to run near Abu Habba; but this is very improbable. There is, south-west from Abu Habba, along the east bend of the Euphrates, a long hill of conglomerate stone, sixty feet high, which would prevent the Euphrates from taking a detour so far to the east as Abu Habba. We may safely conclude that Abu Habba never was on the river, and never could have given its name to the Euphrates. That it was the Sippara of Shamash seems, however, to be beyond question, judging from the tablets, so dated, found there, and the stone tablet of the Sun-god, W. A. I., V. 60, 61.

It was in view of the difficulties that I have indicated that I determined, on my way from Baghdad to the sea-coast, by the route of the Euphrates and the Syrian Desert, to visit the ruin of Sufeirah, where, before Mr. Rassam's excavations at Abu Habba, Sippara had been generally located (Oppert, *Exp. Scient.*, I. 271; Menant, *Bab. et Chald.*, p. 96; Delitzsch, *Wo Lag das Par.*, p. 212; T. G. Pinches, *Transs. Soc. Bib. Arch.* VII. p. 173) as late as 1880. Sufeirah is situated just north of the Nahr Sakhlawieh, which is a chief canal, or river, and is about four or five miles from its point of outflow from the Euphrates. I went completely over it, and found it a low, unimpressive mound, about 250 yards wide, over which there were scattered much less than the usual quantity of bricks and slag. It had no salient elevations or gullies that would make a photograph. I was very much disappointed about it.

Fortunately we were detained in the Arab mud village Sakhlawieh by the rain, and called on the Mudir. Asking him about ruins in the vicinity, he mentioned one called Anbar, which he said was larger than Sufeirah. Not expecting very much, but anxious not to let any chance escape, I walked three miles down the river that night, and again the next morning, to make a more careful examination. I found it not only much larger than Sufeirah, but larger even than Abu Habba, and of a size to compare with those capital ruins of Warka and Niffer. It is a double city, and the principal, or, apparently, older city, is surrounded by walls from thirty to fifty feet high, and with the city nearly on a level with these walls. To the east of this city and its wall, is another city on a lower level, separated from the first by what seems to have been a canal, or moat. The wall, or bank,

on the east side is not continuously clear, but on the west side it is a marked feature. The chief, west city is of irregular height and construction, and there are in it two large courts, on a much lower level than the rest, of irregular shape, and surrounded by high banks, as if they were the courts of ancient palaces or temples that surrounded them. These courts are now used as wheat fields, and, gathering the rains of the banks around them, do not require irrigation. Over large spaces this western city is covered thick with fragments of bricks, with considerable pottery and glass, but I saw no inscribed brick, and I doubt not these fragments belonged to a period of Parthian or Abbassid domination. On the east side of the old city, and on the vertical sides of what looked like a gate, I saw a floor of brick laid in mortar above and below it. The eastern city is large, but on a lower level. As its eastern extremity was a space about two hundred yards square, surrounded by walls of sun-dried bricks, and with a building projecting into the enclosure from the western side. A large bay runs in on the north side, I think between the two cities, almost surrounded by walls. The two cities can hardly be less than a mile long. On the south side is a little Arab village, and on the west a dilapidated ziarat, or Moslem holy place. There is no marked ziggurat, or tower, as at Hammam, or Akerkuf, although some elevations suggest one. The faces are nearly to the cardinal points. There were a number of little outlying tels to the south and south-west. Anbar is but about a mile from the present bed of the Euphrates.

I was extremely surprised and much delighted to find this enormous mound in a place where it had attracted so little attention from previous travelers that it was not on the large Kiepert's map of Turkey, of 1884, which was our constant guide. In about this location a mound, apparently not important, is mentioned under the name of "Tell Akar," in Kiepert's map *Ruinenfelder*, etc. I was convinced, on seeing it, that this must be the original and larger Sippara, the dual Sepharvaim of Scripture, as no other Babylonian city could have been large enough to compete with it. Allowing, if we must, Abu Habba to be the Sippara of Shamash, I am inclined to put Sippara of Anunit, the old capital of Sargon, and the seat of the antediluvian kings, at Anbar. It fulfills the conditions, being the only great city north of Babylon on the Euphrates, and situated on the Sakhiawieh, which is very likely to be the Nahr Agane, and is certainly the Nahar Malka on which the great cities were located which occupied the site of Sippara and supplanted its name in the period from the historians of Alexander's campaigns to Benjamin of Tudela and Abulfeda. I regret that space will not allow me to develop this most interesting portion of the subject, showing how the name of Anbar, which is retained from Arabic writers on the maps down to the early part of this century, and is familiar in the middle ages; and, in the Talmud, the names of Nehardaa, and Shabor (the latter possibly a relic of Sippara, possibly con-

nected rather either with the name of king Sapor, or with Persebora, another earlier name for this place which Zosimus says to have been the largest city but one in Babylonia) have been applied to the old Sippara. Under various slight disguises the name Nehardaa is known to Josephus, Ptolemy, Stephanus Byz., and the Peutingerian Tables, as well as to the Talmud. I take room only to quote Abulfeda, who says that the Isa Canal (formerly the Nahar Malka, now the Sakhlawieh) passed by El Ambara, under the bridge Dahama, in the territory of Feluja; that Anbar, or Ambara, is a day's journey from Baghdad (a long one); and that here the first of the Abbasid Khalifs, the blood-thirsty Abdul Abbas Sefah, settled; but that it was a very old city, built long before by Nebuchadnezzar, who was the first to dig the Nahar Malka, and who settled the nomad Arabs here as tillers of the soil.

A single other point will close this discussion. A little fragment of a tablet in my possession, to whose character Mr. Pinches, of the British Museum, kindly called my attention, is only about an inch square, but it contains complete the four lines—all there were in that section, of the Sumerian column of a bilingual inscription which has an important bearing on this subject. These lines are thus read by Mr. Pinches:

- (1) Sipar D. S.
- (2) Sipar edina D. S.
- (3) Sipar uldua D. S.
- (4) Sipar utu D. S.

This geographical tablet gives a clear indication that there were not one, or two, but four cities or districts called Sippara. By the first we may understand is meant the chief or original Sippara, while the last is the Sippara of Shamash, utu being the Sumerian form of Shamash. The second and third forms are new, although Sipar ulla D. S. is found W. A. I., IV. 38, 1, l. 22 b. The second Sipar edina, or Sipar of Eden, or of the plain, deserves special attention, which I cannot give it now. I only call attention to the fact that this is, so far as I know, the first inscription discovered in which *Eden* occurs as the designation of a geographical region, and so it is very important as confirming Delitzsch's argument in his *Wo lag das Paradies?* As no Sippara of Anunit is distinctively mentioned, it is safe to infer that it is this chief and old Sippara that is meant by the first line where the simple name occurs with the determinative sign only.

It is my conclusion that, while the Sippara of Shamash has been discovered by Mr. Rassam at Abu Habba, the original Sippara, that known as Sippara of Anunit, the Sippara of the most ancient Sargon I., who was exposed in his infancy like Moses in the bulrushes, the Sippara of [Xisuthrus, the city captured by Cyrus "without fighting," the seat of a famous Jewish school, after Ctesiphon the largest city of the times of the Arsacidæ, the Sassanidæ and the Khalifs, is

now to be found south of the point of the effluence of the Sakhlâwîeh from the Euphrates in the mound which I have discovered still bears its mediæval name of Anbar, and which is one of the very largest tels in the valley of the two rivers. It is much to be desired that this mound, never yet touched by the spade of the excavator, might be investigated by American scholars, and the literary treasures buried in this old Pantabibla, whose fame as a city of books is carried by tradition to a period before the Flood, might be recovered for our study.

It may be proper to add here that for much politeness and many favors, while making explorations in the East, I am indebted to Hemdi Bey, who has charge of the Constantinople Museum of Antiquities, and to the Turkish governors of provinces, cities and villages, who never failed to give all the assistance I desired.

INSCRIPTION OF ASURBANIPAL, FROM A BARREL-CYLINDER FOUND AT ABOO-HABBA. V. Rawl. 62, No. 1.

Transliterated and translated by JAMES A. CRAIG and ROBERT F. HARPER, Leipzig.

I. TRANSLITERATION.

1. (m ilu) Ašûr-bân-apal šarru rabû šarru dan-nu šar kiššati šar (mātu) Aššûr šar
kib-rat irbit-ti
2. šar šarrâni rubû la ša-na-an ša ina a-mat ilâni ti-ik-lê-šu ul-tu tam-tim ê-lit
3. a-di tam-tim šap-lit i-bê-lu-ma gi-mir ma-lik ú-šak-niš sê-pu-uš-šu ;
4. apal (m ilu) Ašûr-âḫ-iddin-na šarru rabû šarru dan-nu šar kiššati šar (mātu)
Aššûr šakkânâku Bâbîli (ki)
5. šar (mātu) Šumêr u Akkadi mu-šê-šib Bâbîli (ki) ê-pêš Ê-sag-ila
6. mu-ud-diš êš-rê-ê-ti kul-lat ma-ha-zê ša ina ki-rib-ši-na iš-tak-kan si-ma-ti
7. ũ sat-tuk-kê-ši-na baṭ-lu-tu ú-ki-nu ; bin-bin (m ilu) Sin-aḫê-êrbâ šarru rabû
8. šarru dan-nu šar kiššati šar (mātu) Aššûr a-na-ku-ma. Ina palê-ê-a bêlu rabû
(ilu) Marduk ina rê-ša-a-ti
9. a-na Bâbîli (ki) i-ru-um-ma ina Ê-sag-ila ša da-ra-ti šu-bat-su ir-mê
10. sat-tuk-kê Ê-sag-ila u ilâni Bâbîli (ki) ú-kin ki-tin(dim?)-nu-tu Bâbîli (ki)
11. ak-šur aš-šu dan-nu a-na ênšu la ḫa-ba-li. (m ilu) Šamaš-šum-ukîn âḫû
ta-li-mî
12. a-na šarru-ú-ut Bâbîli (ki) ap-kid ũ ši-pir Ê-sag-ila la ka-ta-a
13. ú-šak-lil ina kaspi ḫurâši ni-sik-ti abnê Ê-sag-ila az-nun-ma
14. ki-ma ši-ṭir bu-ru-mu u-nam-mir Ê-ku-a ũ ša êš-rê-ê-ti ka-li-šj-na
15. ḫi-bil-ta-ši-na ú-šal-lim ê-li kul-lat ma-ha-zê ú-šat-ri-ši *an dul-lum*(?).
16. Ina û-mê-šu-ma Ê-babbar-ra ša ki-rib Sippar (ki) bît (ilu) Šamaš bêli rabê
bêli-ia ša la-ba-riš
17. il-lik-u-ma i-ku-pu in-nab-tu aš-ra-ti-šu aš-tê-, ina ši-pir (ilu) [Libitti(?)]
18. êš-šiš ú-sê-piš-ma ki-ma šadi-i rê-ê-ši-i-šu ul-li a-na šat-ti.....
19. dânu rabû ilâni bêlu rabû bêli-ia êp-sê-ti-ia dam-ka-a-ti ḫa-diš lip-[pa-lis-ma]
20. a-na ia-a-ši (m ilu) Ašûr-bân-apal šar (mātu) Aššûr rubû pa-liḫ-šu balât û-mê
rûkûtê sê-bê-ê lit-[tu-ti]
21. ṭu-ub sêri u ḫu-ud lib-bi li-šim ši-ma-ti u ša (m ilu) Šamaš-šum-[ukîn]
22. šar Bâbîli (ki) âḫi ta-lim-ia û-mê-šu lê-ri-ku liš-bi bu-'a-ri. Ma-[ti-ma]
23. ina aḫ-rat û-mê rubû ar-ku-ú ša ina û-mê palê-šu ši-pir šu-a-ti in-na-ḫu-ma
24. an-ḫu-us-su lu-ud-diš šu-mî it-ti šumi-šu liš-ṭur mu-šar-ú-a lê-mur-ma
25. šamni lip-šû-uš (immêru) nikâ lik-ki it-ti mu-šar-ê-šu liš-kun ik-ri-bi-[šu]
26. (ilu) Šamaš i-šim-mê ša šu-mî šaṭ-ru ũ šum ta-lim-ia ina ši-pir ni-kil-ti
27. i-pa-aš-ši-ṭu šu-mî it-ti šumi-šu la i-šat-ṭa-ru mu-šar-ú-a

28. i-ab-ba-tu-ma it-ti mu-šar-ê-šu la i-šak-ka-nu (ilu) Šamaš bēl ê-la-ti u šap-la-ti
 29. ag-gi-iš lik-kil-mê-šu-ma šumi-šu zêri-šu ina mâlâtî li-ḫal-lik

II. TRANSLATION.

1. Ašurbanipal, the great king, the powerful king, the king universal, the king of Assyria, the king of the four quarters of the world,
2. the king of kings, the prince without an equal, who, by order of the gods, from the upper sea
3. to the lower sea ruled and brought under his subjection all princes;
4. the son of Esarhaddon, the great king, the powerful king, the king universal, the king of Assyria, the mayor of Babylon,
5. the king of Sumeria and Akkadia, who caused Babylon to be inhabited, who built Êsagila,
6. who repaired the temples of all cities, who adorned their interior,
7. and established their discontinued sacrifices; the grand-son of Sennacherib, the great king,
8. the powerful king, the king universal, the king of Assyria, am I. During my reign, the great lord Marduk, with rejoicing,
9. entered Babylon, and, in Êsagila, he established his dwelling forever.
10. The sacrifices of Êsagila and of the gods of Babylon I established, the priesthood of Babylon
11. I strengthened, so as not to injure either powerful or weak. Šamaš-sum-ukîn, my real-brother,
12. I appointed to the sovereignty of Babylon, and the work of Êsagila, which was incomplete,
13. I finished. With silver, gold and precious stones, I decorated Êsagila,
14. and like the variegated heavens, I caused it to shine. Êkua and all the other temples,—
15. their damages I restored, over the whole city I spread out my (protecting) shadow(?).
16. In those days, Ê-babbar-ra, which is in Sippar, the temple of Šamaš, the great lord, my lord,
17. which had become old, had fallen in, and was destroyed, its sanctuaries I sought out, with the work of the [Brick-god^(?)]
18. I caused to be built anew, and, like a mountain, I raised high its spires [...]
19. May the great judge of the gods, the great lord, my lord, look with joy upon my good works.
20. To me, Ašurbanipal, the king of Assyria, the prince, his worshiper, a long life, abundance of offspring,
21. health of body and joy of heart, may he determine as my lot. And as for Šamaš-sum-ukîn,

22. the king of Babylon, my real-brother, may his days be long, and may he be satisfied with glory.
23. In the future, may the later prince, in whose reign this work shall fall into ruin,
24. repair its ruins, my name with his name may he write, my inscription may he see, and
25. with oil may he cleanse (it), a sacrifice may he offer, with his inscription may he place (it), his prayer
26. shall Šamaš hear. Whosoever my name so-written and the name of my real-brother in a work of deceit (*i. e.*, treacherously, deceitfully)
27. obliterates, my name with his name does not write, my inscription
28. destroys, and with his inscription does not place it, may Šamaš, the god of the upper and lower regions,
29. in wrath look upon him, and from the face of the earth blot out his name and his seed.

Nov. 28th, '85.

ADVANTAGES OF A SLIGHT KNOWLEDGE OF HEBREW.

BY FREDERIC GARDINER, D. D.,

Professor in Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn.

The importance to every student of theology of a thorough knowledge of the original language of the Old Testament is so evident as to require little argument. It is not so generally realized that even the slight knowledge of Hebrew acquired in the ordinary routine of our divinity schools is of great value. Men who lay aside their Semitic studies as soon as they enter upon the practical duties of life are apt to think the time they have spent upon them has been almost or wholly wasted. Is this true?

It is to be remembered that the whole Bible, the New Testament as well as the Old, was written by men trained in Semitic habits of thought and modes of expression. Any thing which enables us to better understand those habits and forms of expression must therefore necessarily be of value to the student of Scripture. We believe that even a slight study of Hebrew, or of any other Semitic language, will fix in the mind, in a way never to be forgotten, some important knowledge of this kind which cannot be so well acquired in any other way.

Almost the first lesson learned by the tyro in Hebrew is that the language was originally written only in consonants. Except the meager indications of the "*matres lectionis*," the vowels have been subsequently supplied. Of course these vowels are not arbitrary; they constantly determine the grammatical forms and frequently seriously affect the sense. Still they are secondary; the *radicals* are all consonants. It is not so in our Western languages; what may be learned at the start from this difference? Is it not that to the Semite the *root-idea* of his words, as expressed by their radicals, had a greater relative importance than with us? He cared relatively less than we about its modifications and shades of meaning; his main point was in the fundamental idea.

After mastering the alphabet, the learner will very soon attack the paradigm of the verb. The first thing that will strike him here, so at variance with every thing to which he has been accustomed in the Indo-European languages, is the starting-point. It is no longer the Infinitive, nor the first person of the Present; but the third person of the Narrative tense. This not merely carries us back to the dim beginnings of the growth of language; it shows us what the Hebrews must have been always accustomed to look upon as the starting-point in all they had to say,—narrative, or in other words, facts. The history of what had occurred before them was the foundation on which they rested. And the recognition of this, which may be called the historical habit of mind, is a most important factor in understanding the Scripture writers. Is a divine law to be given re-

quiring the heart's obedience of the people to its Author? It starts with the story of the creation of all things by Him. Is the Evangelist to show that Jesus of Nazareth was the promised and expected Messiah? He begins with His genealogy. Are apostles to proclaim to a lost world salvation through Christ? They set out from the historic fact of His resurrection.

The next peculiarity of the verb which is very surprising and perhaps perplexing to one who has been hitherto occupied with the study of the classic tongues is the poverty of the Semitic languages in tense-distinctions. Evidently to the Semites of old, as to the Semitic races now, ideas of time were not prominent, and the nicer distinctions, so accurately expressed in Greek, were almost or quite unknown. It is true that the New Testament authors wrote in Greek and had learned to use its tenses, when they had occasion, with accuracy. Still, their ancestral speech and their sacred books were in a language in which time was a matter of secondary importance. They lived much nearer than we to the idea of "the Eternal Now," to the divine omnipresence in all time as in all space. What a flood of light does this fact cast upon a large part of the prophecies, and especially upon that New Testament prophecy of the *παρουσία* which has been so much misunderstood. To the Hebrew-born apostles the important point was the thing; the time of its manifestation was altogether secondary. In fact, its overshadowing importance gave it the effect of nearness, just as the overhanging cliff, seen through the vista of a clear air, makes us tremble as if it were upon us, though we may know it to be distant. They thought of it, not in its relation to time, but in its relation to the end of all things.

When the student has learned the Qāl of the simple verb, with only its complete and its incomplete tenses, supplemented by its Imperative, Infinitive and Participle, he turns to the other "conjugations" which answer to our Western "voices." Instead of the two of the Latin, or the three of the Greek, he finds in Hebrew seven, in Syriac eight, and in Arabic no less than thirteen forms of the regular verb active and as many of the passive; so that it becomes difficult or impossible to express in English, even by periphrasis, the precise force of each of this multitude of "voices." Here it is at once seen that, although the Semitic mind was singularly indifferent to the time idea in its verbs, it was correspondingly alive to other modifications of the verbal idea.

Space would fail to speak of all the peculiarities of Semitic grammar which throw light upon the modes of thought and expression in writers of Semitic origin. Passing allusion only can be made to the juxtaposition of nouns, by which the latter is made to qualify the former (often indicated by what is called the *construct state* of the former); so that the two together form one complete idea, thus largely supplying the place of compound terms, and making good the poverty of these languages in adjectives. This throws light upon the use of the Genitive in the New Testament, and should have absolutely forbidden such a marginal read-

ing in the Revision as "judge of unrighteousness" for "unrighteous judge" in Luke XVIII., 6. This is as absurd as "hatred of violence" would be for "violent hatred," for instance in Ps. XXV., 19.

In conclusion, a single word may be said of a common Hebrew method of comparison which, especially when it passes into the language of the New Testament, is often misunderstood. When our Lord says, "I thank thee, O Father, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes" (Luke X., 21), we are not to understand that He is thankful that they are hidden from any one, but that they are revealed to babes *rather than* to the wise and prudent. So when He said to the seventy, rejoicing in their power over evil spirits through his name, "In this rejoice not. . . .but rather rejoice," He does not mean to forbid the lower joy, but only to point them to one infinitely greater. Perhaps the passage where inattention to this form of comparison has been most productive of misunderstanding is St. Paul's quotation from Malachi (Rom. IX., 13; Mal. I., 2) "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." It is true that this passage refers not so much to the individuals mentioned, as to their descendants; yet even so, it is a comparison: "I have loved Jacob more than Esau." Familiarity with Hebrew would have prevented any misunderstanding.

It is not to be supposed that the tyro in Hebrew, especially if he takes little interest in its study, will distinctly formulate to himself these and many other facts which help to the knowledge of the meaning of the Sacred Word. But as we all come to have impressions of our acquaintances which guide our conduct towards them, though we may never make any philosophical analysis of their character; so one can hardly learn even a little of the structure of a Semitic language without, even if it be unconsciously, coming to know what he could hardly learn otherwise of the modes of thought and habits of expression of writers of the Semitic race.

MORIAH.

BY EDWARD G. KING, D. D.,

Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, England.

In Dr. Cheyne's note on this word in the April number of *HEBRAICA*, he seems to assume that the name "Jehovah-jireh" (Gen. xxii., 14) represents the original reading. There is no one point in which the Hebrew text has suffered more change than in the names for *God*. I have given several examples of this in my *Hebrew Words and Synonyms, Part I. The Names of God*. Perhaps one example may suffice for the present purpose.

In Ps. civ., 16, the present Hebrew text has 'עצי יהוה וגו' "The trees of Jehovah are full of sap. . . ." We may, I think, prove beyond a doubt that the original text was עצי אל or עצי איל, for the LXX. reads τὰ ξύλα τοῦ πεδίου; i. e., the text from which the LXX. translated did not read יהוה, but איל; for, if we turn to Ps. xlii., 2, כאיל תערג וגו', Aquila badly translates ὡς αἰλῶν κ. τ. λ., while Versions V. and VI. give ὁ τρόπον πεδίου κ. τ. λ., i. e., the Hebrew איל was translated πεδίου. If now we turn back to Ps. civ., 16, we may confidently assert that the MSS. from which the LXX. translated had (אל or) עצי איל where now we read עצי יהוה. Whether this word אל were intended for *El*, *god*, or for *oak-trees* I do not care to dispute; but that a reviser of the text deliberately changed אל into יהוה is evident. This is only one case out of hundreds.

There is no one point in which the Hebrew text is so little to be trusted as in the reading of the names for *God*. Wholesale changes have taken place *even since the date of the Septuagint translation*. Scholars would do well to attend to the evidence for this before they base arguments on Elohistic or Jehovistic passages. I believe it will be proved that the name יהוה had no place in the original text of Genesis; but that the far older name יה was of frequent occurrence, was known to Abraham, and was originally pronounced *Ah* or *Eh*, as I have endeavored to prove in my *Names of God*. This name יה would naturally be changed by a reviser into יהוה.

Let us now turn to the name Moriah. I admit, with Dr. Cheyne, that it may very possibly be a form of מורה, but I should not call it "a lengthened form" but rather a form after the type מַאֲפִלְיָה, שְׁלֵה־בְתִיָּה, etc. Thus it would denote *The Moreh of God*, or *the high Moreh*. But the word Moreh signifies also a *teacher*. Consequently when Abraham is commanded to go to the land of הַמֶּרְיָה (Gen. xxii., 2) the name may well have suggested to him the fact that "God is teaching." With this thought in his mind, he answers Isaac's question by the words (verse 8) "God will provide," possibly in the very words מַרְיָה; and,

after his deliverance, he calls the name of the place, not *מֹרִיָּה* but *מֵרָאֵה-יְהוָה*; i. e., the "Mountain of God" has become to him a place "Shown of God;" it is henceforth a sacred spot. The writer of Genesis translates this into the language of his own day, and paraphrases Abraham's *מֵרָאֵה-יְהוָה* by *יְהוָה יֵרָאֶה* (verse 14) and adds *כֹּאשֶׁר יֹאמַר הַיּוֹם בְּהָרְ יְהוָה יֵרָאֶה*; i. e., just as, to Abraham, the "Mountain of God" (*מֹרִיָּה*) had become a consecrated spot "Shown of God" (*מֵרָאֵה-יְהוָה*); so, says the writer, "It is said to-day, In the Mount of the Lord a man must appear" (before God, for worship).

Scripture nowhere identifies the Moriah of Abraham with the Moriah of Solomon (2 Chron. III., 1). Indeed it is impossible to suppose that they were the same. But both were scenes of Revelation, and therefore, like Bethel, spots consecrated for worship. Few scholars will be found to maintain that the language spoken by Abraham was the Hebrew of Genesis. If therefore the record contained in Genesis XXII. be an ancient one, it must be a translation. The name for *God*, used by Abraham, would date back to Akkadian times. This condition is not fulfilled by *יְהוָה*, but it is by *יָה*, pronounced *Ah* or *Eh*, which is, I believe, identical in origin with the name for *God* (*An* and *Ea*) among the Akkadians.

A NOTE IN REFERENCE TO THE "MASSORA AMONG THE SYRIANS."

BY PROFESSOR ISAAC H. HALL, PH. D.,
Metropolitan Museum, New York City.

On page 22 of *HEBRAICA* for October, 1885, in Dr. Warfield's translation of the Abbé Martin's section on the Massora among the Syrians, the spelling of *Ebediesu* is given once as "Aud-Icho;" and a few lines below the spelling "Audicho" is given as representing that which "the Nestorians call" the name of "Ebed-Jesu." To those not familiar with the subject, it might seem that the Nestorians had a different orthography; which is not the case. The Nestorians spell the name in the same way as the other Syrians (vocalizing the *waw*, however as *o*); and the "Au," supposing it to be a tolerable French representation, is merely a matter of pronunciation, chiefly of the *beth*, for which the reasons and procedure may be read in Stoddard and Nöldecke. As to the "ch," that is apparently the French method of expressing our "sh;" for the consonant is *shin*.* As the 'ee or 'äyn in both words is unnoticed in the spelling, neither is an adequate representation of the Syrian pronunciation; but that alone would call for no remark.

Is it out of order to protest against the representation, in this generation, of *ṣade* by "ts," as in "Bar-Tsalibi," on page 23 of the same article? To say nothing of the general facts on the subject, and the special fact that "ts" is the perpetuation of a former European misapprehension, which the Europeans themselves are now dropping, it is not possible that Bar Ṣalibi himself or his contemporaries could have so pronounced the name—any more than the modern Arabic- or Syriac-speaking peoples do, among whom the name Ṣalibi is still common. We are gradually outgrowing some of the early mistakes about Oriental consonants—among which was the representation of 'äyn by *ng*, a sound so difficult for the Orientals that they commonly reproduce it in speech as either *n* or *nk*. It is hard to get at the facts in such matters from books alone, even from such an admirable statement of them as is to be found in Wright's *Arabic Grammar*; but it is worth while to try to keep on outgrowing mistakes.

Dr. Warfield deserves the thanks of the readers of *HEBRAICA* for his translation. It is but fair to say, however, that, as is implied in Dr. Warfield's footnote on page 13, this article of the Abbé Martin's by no means exhausts the subject, nor, so far as I am aware, presents any thing more than a short sketch of

* The author's mode of transliteration differs slightly from that which is generally followed in this Journal.

facts and inferences more fully presented elsewhere. Also, that the Abbé Martin's general conclusion presented itself as a possibility to Wiseman about sixty years ago, as to others since. My own conclusion, from going over the ground pretty well, a few years ago, was that the balance of argument favored the existence, past if not present, of a Karkaphensian *version* of at least a portion of the Scriptures, and that, so far as could be ascertained or conjectured, it was based on the Peshitto. A partial hint of the reasons is all that can be given here. The fact is suppressed by Martin that the same MS. which contains the *ܐܡܪ ܡܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ*—which Rosen and Forshall (not Forschall) translated by "*secundum VERSIONEM Karkaphensem!*" (I take the *italics*, etc., from HEBRAICA, for Rosen and Forshall do not have them, of course)—mentions also several times the Peshitto version and the Harklensian version, both of which it calls by the name of *ܡܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ*, in the sense of *version*. The same phenomenon occurs in other manuscripts. At the same time, the manuscript (it is 7183 Rich, British Museum) gives other Massoretic matters besides those taken from the Karkaphensian, Peshitto, and Harklensian "*versions*," taking them from a series of authors and treatises; but it calls none of these latter sources by the above name of *ܡܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ*. Moreover, Rosen and Forshall expressly state in a foot-note, at their rendering "*versionem*," that "*Eodem voce Jacobus Edessenus versiones Simplicem et Heracleensem designat, fol. 99. b.;*" showing that they had considered the matter. The statement of their foot-note, however, needs a little explanation: instead of *James of Edessa* designating the Peshitto and Harklensian by the same word, it is *this MS.* that does so, at the place which they correctly cite, viz., fol. 99. b.; and the whole MS. is ascribed by its title to James of Edessa, though it—original composition, as well as this copy—is probably much later than his time. Rosen and Forshall might doubtless have cited Gregory Bar Ebraeus for the same use of the term; but their quotations from the latter's "*Treasure of Mysteries*" only show that he put the Peshitto, the Harklensian, and the Karkaphensian on the same footing as Scripture, by a common designation, as if all were *versions*; while other sources that were not versions have a different designation. Rosen and Forshall might have further fortified their rendering by citing the title to the Hexaplar, where the same word is used of the Septuagint *version*. So *!Assemâni*, Wiseman, Rosen and Forshall, and others, have a pretty sound basis to stand upon, which the Abbé Martin does not (at least in the matter translated by Dr. Warfield) care to show to his more popular readers, although he is well aware of its existence. In this light his capitals and exclamation point do not quite suit Saxon frankness. A study of the use of *ܡܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܢ* in Syriac literature would still further diminish the scarecrow force of his exclamation point and capitals; but into this we need not go—at least no further than to remark that the "*tradition*" in the word means rather "*delivered*" than "*handed down*," or than "*received from old time*." In that sense it is much

like παράδοσις and παραδίδωμι; and in several places where, from our English version or the Greek, we might expect to find it, it is replaced in the Peshitto New Testament by ܡܕܢܚܐ, *teaching, doctrine, (teacher's) commandment*. As applied to a *version*, the etymology might make us suppose that the medial step was to indicate *the translation delivered by*—e. g., the Seventy; but etymological reminders do not outweigh usage in the definition or understanding of a word.

Just two things more may be mentioned. One is that, if the quotation from Assemâni had included two more of his lines, it would appear that the above triple assemblage of versions, or whatever the common designation of them means, were reckoned as occupying a higher plane than the Nestorian copies of the Scriptures. These lines read: "Demum singulis fere paginis notantur variæ lectiones, seu punctuationes *Nestorianorum*, hoc est, Chaldæorum, qui Nestorii labe infecti sunt." The other thing is, that it is hard to explain *all* the statements and Scripture extracts in Wiseman, under the general Karkaphensian subject, as belonging merely to the Syriac Massora, to a *correctorium* whose scope was larger, or even to an exegetical work. I may say, also, to show that a short extract may *seem* to be from an exegetical work, and yet be part of a double version, that Syriac MSS. exist (one of the sort is in my hands just now) in which *two versions* of an entire composition occupy the same pages; a sentence of one version following a sentence of the other, all through—much after the fashion of an interlinear translation, only it is not interlinear, but in interrupting portions.

Had we only these Syriac Massora MSS., and not the actual Peshitto and Harklensian too (and perhaps we may include the Septuagint also), the Abbé Martin's arguments would inevitably sweep them out of existence along with the Karkaphensian. His statement that all the mountains of Europe and Asia have been ransacked, and every crack and cranny searched, is hyperbolic, and not enough to show that no fragment of a Karkaphensian may yet turn up. The European libraries alone have not yet told all their secrets to the ransackers. It is better to study the Syrian Massora, and reap its benefits, holding in suspense the question of the existence of a Karkaphensian version, than to throw away the stimulus which the balance of argument seems now to furnish in the line of possible discovery. Unless, indeed, we may see another alternative, in the Abbé's conclusions, and begin a general ransacking for MSS. which present hitherto unknown Massoras, but which must exist somewhere as the Peshitto, Harklensian, Septuagint, and other "traditions."

ON THE PENITENTIAL PSALM "DE PROFUNDIS."

BY PROFESSOR PAUL HAUPT, PH. D.,

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

In the prospectus for the second volume of *HEBRAICA*, it was announced that I should publish a commentary on the fifteen so-called *Songs of Degrees*, Hebrew *שירי המעלות*, i. e., *The Songs of the Return*¹ (from the Exile),² Psalms CXX.—CXXXIV. I fear that I shall not, in the near future, find time to complete this task, and will therefore content myself, for the present, with offering Psalm CXXX,³ heretofore commonly misunderstood, in text and translation. As to the commentary, I shall limit myself to some brief preliminary remarks.

The text of this fervent penitential song is, according to my opinion, to be restored in the following manner:

שִׁיר מַעֲלָה
אֲמַעֲמִיקִים⁴ קִרְאֲתִיךָ יְהוָה
אֲרָנִי שְׁמַעְהָ בְּקוֹלִי
תַּהֲיֶינָה אֲזוּנֶיךָ⁶ קִשְׁבוֹת
לְקוֹל תַּחֲנוּנִי

¹ Cf. Ezra vii., 9: *המעלה מבבל*. I will note here that my predecessor in the chair of Semitic Languages at the Johns Hopkins University, Thomas C. Murray, (whom an untimely death called away), in his interesting and suggestive *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of the Psalms* (New York: Scribner, 1880), p. 295, adopts the explanation proposed by Agellius, Herder, Hitzig, Hengstenberg, Reuss, Kamphausen, and others,—*Songs of Feast Journeys, or Pilgrim Songs*. Cf. also Friedlaender, *Zur Erklärung der Psalmen*, Stettin, 1857, p. 16.

² This of course can also mean "Songs of the first period after the return from exile." Concerning the plural *מעלות*, it will be useful to bear in mind that "A Song of the Return from Babylon" would be in Hebrew *שִׁיר מַעֲלָה מִבָּבֶל*, without the article before *מעלה*. The plural to this, "*Songs of the Return*," can be expressed in three different ways, either *שִׁירֵי מַעֲלָה* or *שִׁירֵי מַעֲלוֹת* (cf. Hitzig, *Psalmen* II., 365: "den Plural *מעלות* wuerde nicht die Stelle Ez. xi., 5, sondern nur Plur. auch des Stat. const. rechtfertigen."), or finally *שִׁיר מַעֲלוֹת*. In the same way in Ethiopic there occurs as plural to *beta krestiyān church* either *abyata krestiyān* or *abyata krestiyānat* or *beta krestiyānat*. See Dillmann's *Grammar*, p. 365; Muller-Robertson, *Outlines of Hebrew Syntax*, 2d ed., Glasgow, 1883, § 77; Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*, § 108, 3. *שִׁיר המעלות*, with the article before the *nomen rectum*, can only mean, like *שִׁירֵי המעלות*, "*the songs of the return*," and is therefore out of place as the superscription of a single Psalm.

³ Luther once termed this Psalm, along with Psalms xxxii., li., and cxliii., as *Psalmi Paulini*; see Moll, *Der Psalter, theologisch-homiletisch bearbeitet*. Part II. Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1871, p. 185. Also A. Tholuck, in his *Uebersetzung und Auslegung der Psalmen*, 2d ed., Gotha, 1873, p. 704, says, "the Psalmist here promulgates the true evangelical doctrine of the New Testament; teaching, according to Exod. ii., 6 and 7, that the enduring existence and prosperity of sinful people is only possible through divine forgiveness."

⁴ Cf. Ps. lxi., 8: *אֲנַצֵּלָה מִשְׁנְאֵי* I am come into deep waters; Ps. lxi., 15: *אֲנַצֵּלָה מִמְּעַמְקֵי מִים* let me be delivered from them that hate me and out of the deep waters; Isa. li., 10:

ה אם עונות תשמר-יה
 אדני מי יעמר :
 כי-עמך⁷ הסליחה
 למען תירא

י קויתי יהוה
 ולדברו קותה נפשי⁸
 הוחילה נפשי לאדני
 משמרים לבקר :

טו שמרים לבקר
 יחל ישראל אל-יהוה
 כי-עם-יהוה החסר
 והרבה עמו פדות⁹

עת נשפרת מימים במעמקי-מים מערבך : Ezek. xxvii., 34: *the depths of the sea*; *now art thou broken* (Jonah i., 4; I Kgs. xxii., 48) *from the seas, in the depths of the waters thy merchandise and all thy company in the midst of thee are fallen.*

⁵ If I could find the time to carry out a long entertained plan of publishing a *Hebrew Chrestomathy*, I should but partly vocalize all the texts, and arrange the words in the *Glossary* according to the stems. That the latter system gives the beginner too much difficulty, is an erroneous supposition. The student who can look up a verbal form like אט under נטה, will, I presume, also be able to find out the stem of nouns like מקלח, etc. For more complicated cases an *Analytical Index* could be added. As to the vocalization of the texts, I consider it superfluous to point words like אלהים, ואמר, הארץ, etc., throughout. An entirely unpunctuated text, on the other hand, like the *Liber Genesis sine punctis exscriptus* cur. Muehlau and Kautzsch (ed. altera, Lipsiae, 1885) is hard to employ for educational purposes. Certain difficult words should, by all means, be pointed. But then, above all, a *critical text*, with emendations of the corrupt passages, should be established. The more this departs from the Massoretic text, the better for practical linguistic training. Ps. cxxii., 3, 5, e. g., I should write, ערת שחפרה-לה ערת, ירושלם הכנויה בעיר שחפרה-לה ערת, *Israel's helper*: כי שמה עלו שבטים שבטי-יה להורות לשם: ששם ישבו בקאות וגו' ויאספו מעמי הארצות ויבינו המוכח על-מכונתו כי בא אימה עליהם ויעלו עליו עלות וגו' 3: It stands to reason that the first extracts must be vocalized throughout; but the points should gradually become more scarce. This is the only way to really learn Hebrew. "In order that I may not be misunderstood," says Lagarde (*Symmicta*, II., 23), "I will add that it is no proof of an acquaintance with Hebrew to have attended, or for that matter to have given, lectures on the Old Testament." Cf. also *Mittheilungen* von Paul de Lagarde, Goettingen, 1884, p. 164, and Hitzig, *Psalmen*. I., p. iv.

⁶ Cf. 2 Chron. vi., 40: *עתה אלהי יהו-נא עיניך פתחות ואוזניך קשבות לתפלת המקום הזה*: "Now, my God, let, I beseech thee, thine eyes be open and let thine ears be attent unto the prayer that is made in this place." Cf. *ibid.*, vii., 15.

⁷ Cf. Neh. ix., 17: *אתה אלוה סליחות*: "thou art a God of pardons;" Dan. ix., 9: *לאדני*: "To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgiveness, though we have rebelled against him."

⁸ Cf. Isa. viii., 17: *קניתי לו*: "I look for him;" Prov. xx., 22: *קנה ליהוה וישע לך*: "Wait on the Lord and he shall save thee."

⁹ Cf. Ps. cxi., 9: *פרות שלח לעמו*: "He sent redemption unto his people;" Isa. l., 2: *הקצור*: "Is my hand shortened at all that it cannot redeem?" or have I no power to deliver?"

כֹּה וְהוּא יְפַרֵּה אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל
מִכָּל עֲוֹנוֹתָיו
יְחַל יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל-יְהוָה
מִעֵתָה וְעַד-עוֹלָם

This *Prayer for the Forgiveness of Sins on Atonement-day*, as Rev. Robert Weber¹ has appropriately superscribed the poem, I translate as follows:—

Out of the depths² I have cried unto thee, Yahweh.
O Lord! hearken unto my voice;
Let thine ears be attentive
To the voice of my supplications.

If thou shouldst keep³ iniquities, Yah,
O Lord! who *then* shall endure?—⁴
For with thee is forgiveness
For the sake of the Religion.⁵

¹ See *Die poetischen Buecher des Alten Testaments uebersetzt und erklart von Robert Weber*, evang. reform. Pfarrer. Stuttgart: C. P. Scheitlin, 1853, p. 323. According to Adolf Kamphausen (*Die Psalmen*, Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1863, p. 253, reprinted from Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*) only verses 7 and 8 treat of the people of Israel; otherwise, he says, the Psalm appears to be entirely personal. Hitzig (*Die Psalmen*, Vol. II. Leipzig and Heidelberg, 1865, p. 386), on the other hand, remarks, that the Psalmist appears here as interceder for the sins of the people. E. W. Hengstenberg (*Commentar ueber die Psalmen*, Vol. IV., 2d ed. Berlin, 1852, p. 401) is right in saying, "Out of the depths of misfortune the congregation cries unto the Lord, praying that, according to his compassion, he may forgive their sins through which they have been cast into distress." It is also possible that only strophes 1, 3 and 5 were said by the congregation, and strophes 2 and 4 by the priest. Rosenmueller's conjecture (*Scholia in Vetus Testamentum*) that the Psalm was first sung at the general penitential day, Ezra ix., 5, cannot be proved.

² This does not mean "Out of the deep abyss of sin" (Geier, Weber), but "sunk in the deep waves of distress" which have come over us in consequence of our sins. Cf. Ps. lxi., 2 and 3, and *ibid.*, 14 and 15. As is well known, Luther begins his beautiful penitential song, which closely follows this Psalm: "*Aus tiefer Noth schrei ich zu Dir.*"

³ If thou shouldst keep *in memory*, that is, cherish against, put to the account of. According to Ewald (*Die Dichter des Alten Bundes*, I., 1, 3d ed. Goettingen, 1866, p. 373) = if thou dost not overlook, condone, forgive. The meaning is nearly the same.

⁴ Supply: But thou wilt not deal with us after our [sins; nor reward us according to our iniquities; Ps. cxli., 10: כַּחַטֵּאֵינוּ תַעֲשֶׂה לָנוּ וְלֹא כְעֹנֵתֵינוּ תִגְמַל עֲלֵינוּ. German: *Aber Du wirst Gnade fuer Recht ergehen lassen.*

⁵ That is: We in our sins are unworthy of thy grace, but do forgive us for the sake of the true Religion revealed by thee, of which we are the only though unworthy representatives. In spite of all our misdeeds, we are still thy people and the sheep of thy pasture. Therefore, deliver us and purge away our sins, for thy name's sake. Help us, O God of our salvation, for the glory of thy name. Wherefore should the heathen say, Where is their God? Pour out thy wrath upon the heathen that have not known thee, and upon the kingdoms that have not called upon thy name. But show mercy to us that fear thee, to such as keep thy covenant, and to

I hope for Yahweh,
And for his word¹ hopeth my soul;
My soul waiteth for the Lord
More than they that² watch for the morning.

Ye that watch for the morning!³
Wait, Israel, for Yahweh!
For with Yahweh is grace,
And in abundance⁴ is with him redemption.

And He will redeem Israel
From all his iniquities.⁵
Wait, *therefore*, Israel for Yahweh
From now and for evermore!

The reading תִּירָא, with י instead of ך at the end of the second strophe, is authenticated by Saint Jerome.⁶ Graetz, in his critical commentary to the Psalms,⁷ remarks for this passage: "למען תִּירָא" is quite incomprehensible, the reading being uncertain. Symmachus and Theodotion render it by νόμος or νόμος σου,⁹ LXX. by νόμου σου,¹⁰ probably misread for νόμος. Worthy of note is Jerome's

those that remember thy commandments to do them. Ps. lxxix., 13, 9, 10, 6; Ps. ciii., 17, 18: אנהנו עמך וצאן מרעיתך הצילנו וכפר על-חטאתינו למען ושמך עזרנו אלהי יִשְׁעֵנו על-דבר כבוד-שמך למה יאמרו הגוים איה אלהיהם שפך חמתך אל-הגוים אשר לא-ידעוך ועל-ממלכות אשר בשמך לא קראו עשה חסד עם-יִרְאִיךָ לשמרי בריתך ולזכרי פְּקִדֶיךָ לעשותם

¹ Cf. Exod. xx., 6: י, Yahweh, thy God . . . will show mercy unto the thousandth generation of them that love me and keep my commandments.—According to Ewald, "the everlasting word of God through 'all time, the word of salvation and redemption."

² After a night's vigil.

³ For the morning glow of his grace, with which a new day breaks after the night of sins.

⁴ For many, and even for the greatest distress.

⁵ And the sufferings that follow them. Cf. הָעֵץ, Isa. v., 18, and my remarks in my article *Watch-ben-Hazael*, p. 3 (HEBRAICA, Vol. I., No. 4).

⁶ I should like to call attention here to the useful little book by Wilhelm Nowack (now Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in Strassburg), *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus fuer die attestamentliche Textkritik untersucht*, Goettingen, 1875.

⁷ *Kritischer Commentar zu den Psalmen nebst Text und Uebersetzung*. Von Dr. H. Graetz, Vol. II., p. 651. Breslau: Schottlaender, 1883.

⁸ The Syriac Version and the Arabic Version of the פְּשִׁיטָתָא Psalms, published in the Libanon at Quzhayya in 1610, omit these two words entirely.

⁹ In the Vulgate: propter legem (tuam sustinui te, Domine. The *Psalterium juxta Hebræos Hieronymi* (e recognitione Pauli de Lagarde, Lipsiae, 1874, p. 136) has: cum terribilis sis; cf. Ps. lxxvi., 8: cum terribilis es, et quis stabit adversum te? Heb. אַתָּה נִירָא אַתָּה וּמִי-יַעֲמֹד לִפְנֶיךָ.

¹⁰ Ἐνεκεν τοῦ νόμου σου seems to me simply guessed at by reference to passages like Ps. lxxix., 9; xxiii., 3, etc.

tradition on this point (*Epistola ad Sun[niam] et Fret[elam]*, No. 78): "Pro nomine sive lege apud eos (Hebraeos) legitur *Thira*, quod... Symmachus et Theodotion νόμον interpretati sunt... putantes *Thora*, propter literarum similitudinem Jod et Vau, quae tantum magnitudine distinguuntur." According to this, the text contained תִּירָא, not תּוֹרָא or תּוֹרָה.¹

The תַּרְגּוּם כְּתוּבִים,² too, seems to have read תִּירָא, erroneously regarding it as scriptio plena of the imperfectum apocopatam Niphal from תִּירָא : רָאָה = תִּירָא = תִּירָאָה. We find there as the translation of our verse: אֲרוֹם גִּבְךָ שְׂבִיקוּתָא מִן בְּגִלְלָא דְּתַתְּחִמִּי for *with thee is forgiveness that thou mayest be seen*.⁴

I read תִּירָא, and consider it a rare synonym of יִרָאָה. It seems to be a form with prefixed ת from יִרָא to fear, like תִּימֵן⁵ south, properly the right side, from יָמֵן. The word תִּירָא here must have the same meaning as יִרָאָה in Ps. XIX., 10:

יִרְאֵת יְהוָה טְהוֹרָה עוֹמֶדֶת לְעֶד מִשְׁפָּטִי-יְהוָה אֱמֶת צִדְקוֹ יִחַד

The Yahweh religion is pure, enduring forever;

Yahweh's ordinances are truth and righteous altogether.

For the use of יִרָאָה without the following יְהוָה cf. Job IV., 6:

הֲלֹא-יִרְאֵתָךְ בְּסִלְתְּךָ וְתִקְוֶתָךְ תִּם דְּרִכֶּיךָ

Is not thy piety thy confidence; thy hope the uprightness of thy ways?

In the third strophe I have changed הוֹלַחְתִּי to הוֹחִילָה, and transposed וּלְדַבְּרוֹ. These emendations are confirmed by the Ancient Versions.

The LXX. translate: ὑπέμεινὰ σε, κύριε, ὑπέμεινεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου εἰς τὸν λόγον σου· ἡλπισεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον . . .

The Vulgate:⁸ sustinui te, Domine, sustinuit anima mea in verbo ejus; speravit anima mea in Domino, etc.

תִּשְׁכַּח בְּחַלְמֵי שִׁמְעֵי נֶפֶשׁ לְחַלְלָאִס : שְׁמַח לְחַלְלָאִס : פְּשִׁיטָתָא⁹

¹ That the choice of the rare word תִּירָא is an intended assonance to תּוֹרָה law is not excluded.

² *Hagiographa Chaldaice*. Paulus de Lagarde edidit. Lipsiae, 1873, p. 77.

³ Cf. תִּיעֲשֶׂה Exod. XXV., 31, for תִּעֲשֶׂה יִדֶּע; Ps. cxxxviii., 6, for יִדֶּע; אֵלֶיךָ for אֵלֶיךָ Mich. i., 8.

⁴ Cf. also the rendering of the *Sexta*: ἐνεκεν τοῦ σπενδῆσαι λόγον σου, on the strength of which Graetz proposes to read תּוֹרָה דְּבִרְךָ, or simply תּוֹרָה דְּבִרְךָ.

⁵ Cf. Olshausen, *Lehrbuch der hebraeischen Sprache*, Braunschweig, 1861, p. 399; Stade, *Lehrbuch der hebr. Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1879, § 261 a; Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 85, 51. If we prefer to vocalize תִּירָא we must compare forms like תִּדְרָה, Isa. xli., 19; lx., 13; תִּמְנֶע, etc. (Olshausen, 399), or the feminine forms תִּקְוָה hope, תִּנְרָה strife, Ps. xxxix., 11; תִּבְלָה perfection, Ps. cxix., 96.

⁶ In the Massoretic text the י is placed before the following תִּם. ותם רכִּיךָ תִּקְוֶתךָ as Umbreit (*Das Buch Hiob*, 2d. ed., Heidelberg, 1832, p. 34) proposes to read, would destroy the rhythm.

⁷ Observe the *chiasmus*. For the pre-position of the predicate cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 145. l. b.

⁸ In the *Psalterium juxta Hebraeos Hieronymi*, on the other hand, we read in accordance with the Massoretic text: sustinui dominum, sustinuit anima mea, et verbum ejus expectavi; anima mea ad dominum, etc. The תַּרְגּוּם כְּתוּבִים has: אֲמַתִּינִית יְהוָה מַתִּינָת נַפְשִׁי וְלֹאִיקְרִיָּה אֲוִיכִית . . . אֲוִיכִית לִיהוָה . . . נַפְשִׁי (cf. Job vi., 11).

⁹ For the name of the chief Syriac version of the Bible see Professor Isaac H. Hall's remarks in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. XI., No. II., p. CXXIII (*Proceedings at New*

in Hebrew transcription: סְבִרַת בְּמַרְיָא וְסִבִּית נַפְשִׁי לְמַלְתָּה סִבִּית לְמַרְיָא ..

So we read also in the four Arabic Versions edited by Paul de Lagarde:¹

يا رب ترجيت
ولكلمتك رجيت نفسي
نفسى توكلت على الرب

يا رب رجوتك
لزممت نفسي ناموسك
نفسى توكلت على الرب

ارتجيت بالرب
وانتظرت نفسي لكلمته
ترجيت الرب

صبرت لك يا رب
صبرت نفسي فى قولك
توكلت نفسي على الرب

Yâ rabbi tarajjaitu
wa-likálimatika rájat nafsî
nafsî tawákkalât 'alâ-'r-rabbi, etc.

Yâ rabbi rajaútuka
lázimat nafsî nâmúsaka
nafsî tawákkalât 'alâ-'r-rabbi, etc.

Irtajaitu bi-'r-rabbi
wá-'ntazarat nafsî likálimatihi
tarajjaitu-'r-rabba, etc.

Sabartu laka² yâ rabbi
şábarat nafsî fî qaulika
tawákkalât nafsî 'alâ-'r-rabbi, etc.

York, October, 1882). Cf. also Friedrich Baethgen, *Untersuchungen ueber die Psalmen nach der Peschita*, Kiel, 1878, p. 7, and Noeldeke, *Syr. Grammar*, § 26, B.

¹ *Psalterium Job Proverbia Arabice*. Paulus de Lagarde edidit. Goettingen, 1876, pp. 214/5. No. 1 is the *Versio Romana* of 1614, No. 2 the *Parisina* (in the Paris Polyglot), No. 3 the *Quzhayensis* (cf. p. 101, n. 8), No. 4 the *Beræensis* (Abulfath's Version, after the Aleppo edition of 1706). Cf. Lagarde, *Symmicta*, II., Goettingen, 1880, p. 10.

² *Sabartu laka I wait for thee* (cf. נַפְשִׁי אֵוִיכָא, p. 102, n. 8) is modern Arabic, *sabarat nafsî*, on the other hand, is used also in the classical language; cf. لو حبس الرجل نفسه. على شيء يريد أن قال صبرت نفسي.

In Aramaic, the form הוֹחִילָה would be אוֹחִלָת or הוֹחִלָת, and to the third pers. fem. sing. perf. there is attached sometimes in Syriac a parasitic ' as a dia-critical mark, e. g., ܡܠܬܐ she has killed, for ܡܠܬܐ qitlat.¹ That the change of הוֹחִילָה to הוֹחִלָת has any connection with this fact is difficult to assume.

The repetition of the שְׁמֵרִים לְבָקֵר in the beginning of the fourth strophe has heretofore been commonly misunderstood, since no one perceived that the words, with a delicate turn of the figure, are used as accosting the congregation. The vocative construction is implied in the following imperative יְחַל יִשְׂרָאֵל, which is by no means to be altered to a jussive יְחַל or יִחַל.

Bickell² in his metrical³ translation of the Psalms, entirely omits this significant repetition. De Wette⁴ considers the second שְׁמֵרִים לְבָקֵר merely "*Wiederholung im Geiste des Stufen-rhythmus*;" so, too, Olshausen⁵ says, it has a significance only for the outward form of the recitation. Graetz thinks, the repetition might be intended as an *antiphony* of the chorus. Hengstenberg remarks: The night seems long to the watchers and so to the suffering the night of affliction. "*Schmerzliche Sehnsucht liebt die Wiederholung*." According to Delitzsch⁶

¹ Cf. Noeldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1880, p. 35. The ' was perhaps added by analogy to the second person: ܡܠܬܐ, fem. ܡܠܬܐ. The ' in ܡܠܬܐ she may also have had some influence. Similarly, in the third pers. fem. impf., e. g., ܡܠܬܐ. Duval's theory (*Traité de Grammaire Syriacque* par Rubens Duval, Paris, 1881, p. 173) that "le youdh quiescent de la troisième personne du féminin sing. vient sans doute d'une ancienne voyelle i, ou qui formait la desinence de l'imparfait," like the Arabic yaqtulu, taqtulu, seems to me untenable. I do not believe that this ' was ever pronounced.

² See *Dichtungen der Hebräer*, Zum ersten Male nach dem Versmasse des Urtextes [?] uebersetzt von Gustav Bickell. III. *Der Psalter*, Innsbruck, 1883, p. 250. Bickell renders the passage: "Ich hoff' auf Gott, auf Sein Wort | Harrt meine Seele. | Mehr als auf Fruehrot Waechter, | Harr', Israel, Sein!" Cf. also Johann David Michaelis *Deutsche Uebersetzung des Alten Testaments, mit Anmerkungen fuer Ueelerhrte*. Part VI., 2d ed., Goettingen, 1782, p. 206: "Meine Begierde sieht nach dem Herrn aus, | Mehr als einer, der zur Nachtzeit reiset, auf den Morgen wartet. | Israel hoffe auf Jehova," etc. In the notes, however, on p. 276, he gives the correct translation: "more than they that watch for the morning." Ernst Meier, *Die poetischen Buecher des alten Testaments uebersetzt und erlaeutert*, Part II., *Die Psalmen*, Stuttgart, 1850, p. 156, translates: "[Es hofft] meine Seele | Auf den Herrn, | Mehr als Waechter | Auf den Morgen. || Israel, harre," etc.

³ Bickell is right in assuming, in his translation of our Psalm, strophes of four lines. Olshausen, in his commentary on the Psalms (Leipzig, 1853), deemed it proper to arrange this psalm in four strophes of two verses each. Also Julius Ley (*Grundzuege des Rhythmus, des Vers- und Strophenbaues in der hebraeischen Poesie*, Halle, 1875, p. 148) says that the division of this poem into distichos was recognized by the ancient interpreters. His metrical analysis is: first, three strophes of two hexameters, then a fourth of one octameter and an octametric hemi-stich=two hexameters.

⁴ *Commentar ueber die Psalmen*, 5th ed., ed. by Gustav Baur. Heidelberg, 1856, p. 591 below.

⁵ *Die Psalmen erklært* von Justus Olshausen. Leipzig, 1853, p. 463. On Olshausen compare Eberhard Schrader's *Gedaechtnisrede auf Justus Olshausen* (Transactions of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences), Berlin, 1883.

⁶ Franz Delitzsch, *Biblischer Commentar ueber die Psalmen*, 4th ed. Leipzig, 1883, p. 806.

the repetition gives the impression "*des langhin sich dehnenden schmerzlichen Wartens.*" Likewise the Ancient Versions fail to find the point. Jerome translates in his *Psalterium juxta Hebraeos*: *anima mea ad dominum a vigilia matutina¹ usque ad vigiliam matutinam*; Symmachus: ἀπὸ φυλακῆς πρωΐνης ἕως φυλακῆς πρωΐνης; the LXX. even: ἀπὸ φυλακῆς πρωίας καὶ μέχρι νύκτος, and following this the Vulgate: *anima mea in Domino a custodia matutina usque ad noctem*. Rabbi Saadia,² also, says that for the sake of the sense the first "morning" must denote the day, the second the night!

In the last strophe I have added the final verse of the following Psalm. In Psalm CXXXI., which I regard as the fragment of an *Epitaph* on the first post-exilic High-priest Jeshua,³ these words are out of place and without connection with what precedes. That Psalm CXXXII. already in the time of the Chronicler was placed near CXXX. is shown by 2 Chron. VI., 40-42.⁴ Accordingly we may safely assume that Psalm CXXXI. followed Psalm CXXX. at that time, and there is no difficulty in supposing that, even at that early period, the end of Psalm CXXX. was added to the Fragment Psalm CXXXI., 1 and 2, in order to give it a proper conclusion.

Further explanatory remarks I reserve for a future article.

POSTSCRIPT.

It is only to-day that I was able to look up, in the original, the passage cited by Graetz from St. Jerome's *Epistola CVI. ad Sunniam et Fretelam*, § 78; and I found that the remarks omitted by Graetz are the very ones that confirm my conjecture למען ה' for the sake of the religion. It might be well, therefore, to add the entire passage, together with the foot-note in the Paris⁵ edition:

"78. Centesimo vigesimo nono, *Propter legem tuam sustinui te, Domine* (Ps. CXXXIX., 4). Dicitis vos in Graeco invenisse: *Propter nomen tuum*, et nos confite-

¹ *Vigilia matutina* is אֶשְׁמְרֶת הַבֹּקֶר. I take this opportunity of calling attention to Friedrich Delitzsch's essay on *Die drei Nachtwachen*, No. III. of his *Assyriologische Notizen zum Alten Testament* in Dr. Bezold's *Zeitschrift fuer Keilschriftforschung*, Vol. II., Part III., July, 1885.

² See Ewald, *Ueber die arabisch geschriebenen Werke juedischer Sprachgelehrten*. Stuttgart, 1844, p. 70. On Saadia's translation of the Psalms cf. also Samuel Hirsch Margulies, [*Saadia Alfayumi's arabische Psalmuebersetzung* (Leipzig Inaugural-Dissertation). Breslau, 1884.

³ Hitzig (*Die Psalmen*, II., 388), to be sure, thinks that Ps. cxxxi. was written about September 18th, 141 B. C.! In the פְּשִׁיטָתָא superscription of this Psalm we find: מְתַאמֵר עַל יֵשׁוּעַ בֶּר יוֹדֵק כְּהֵנָּה רִבָּא. Cf. Graetz, l. c., p. 652.

⁴ See Carl Ehrt, *Abfassungszeit und Abschluss des Psalters zur Pruefung der Frage nach Makka, baerpsalmen*. Leipzig, 1869, p. 72; Delitzsch, l. c., p. 804 below; Riehm in Hupfeld, *Die Psalmen*, 2d ed. Vol. IV. Gotha, 1871, p. 330.

⁵ *Hieronymi Stridonensis Presbyteri Opera Omnia*, ed. J. P. Migne, Tom. I., Paris, 1864, col. 865/6 = pp. 674/5 of Vallarsi's edition, Tom. prim., Pars prima, editio altera, Venetiis MDCCLXVI.

mur plura exemplaria sic reperiri. Sed quia veritati studemus, quid in Hebraeo sit, simpliciter debemus dicere. Pro, *nomine*, sive, *lege*, apud eos legitur THIRA, quod Aquila interpretatus est φόβον, *timorem*:¹ Symmachus, et Theodotion² νόμον, id est, *legem*, putantes THORA, propter litterarum similitudinem Jod, et Vau, quae tantum magnitudine distinguuntur. Quinta³ Editio, *terrorem*, interpretata est, Sexta,³ *verbum*."

PAUL HAUPT.

Baltimore, Md., Dec. 24, '85.

¹ Cf. Origenis *Hexaplorum* quae supersunt; sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta, ed. Fridericus Field, Oxonii: e typographeo Clarendoniano, MDCCCLXXV, p. 285: 'Α. ἔνεκεν φόβον ὑπέμεινα κύριον.—Sic ἄλλος apud Chrysost.—Theodoret.: ἀντὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος, ὁ μὲν 'Α. καὶ ὁ Θ. φόβον ἡρμήνευσαν, ὁ δὲ Σ. νόμον. Aliter Hieronym. in Epist. ad Sun. et Fret. 78: "Dicitis," etc., etc.—Cf. also ibid., p. 287, n. 4: Montef. sine auctore affert: Ε', ἐπὶ φόβον.

² Obstat Theodoretus, qui ἔνεκεν τοῦ φόβον, juxta Aquilam etiam Theodotionem interpretatum fuisse asserit. Quoad Hebraeam vocem Thira, textus hodiernum habet Thora, תּוֹרָה, quod tamen vocabulum, quod cum Aleph scribatur, non *He*, *Lex* verti Latine, aut νόμος Graece, non debuit. Itaque hallucinationis occasio non ex similitudine י et ך oritur, quae litterae sola magnitudine differant, sed ex sono postremae litterae ך scilicet aut י qui fere idem est, et potuit Symmachus et Theodotion in ea voce תּוֹרָה censere י cum ך fuisse permutatum; quamquam istud, quod Breitingerus animadvertit, לַמַּעַן תּוֹרָה in Hebraismo insolentius.

³ Cf. Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, p. 36.

DRIVER ON THE HEBREW TENSES.*

BY PROF. JAMES STRONG, S. T. D., LL. D.,

Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

After a careful examination of this work, and a protracted comparison in the course of my Hebrew reading, I am unable to acquiesce in its conclusions, and I beg leave to state briefly, for the consideration of scholars, my reasons for dissent.

The main position of the book is that the primary and essential distinction between the so-called Præter and Future tenses in Hebrew, is that the former denotes a fully *completed* act or condition, and the latter an *inceptive* or incomplete one. This point the author elucidates by a detailed application to the various uses and constructions of these forms of the Hebrew verb, including an attempt to solve thereby the mystery of the "vav conversive." Much of the reasoning is very indirect and intricate. I take room to examine only the main point, and that in relation chiefly to the use of the so-called "Future tense;" which is the most difficult and peculiar. I give the author's doctrine in his own words: "One [form] is calculated to describe an action as incipient and so as imperfect; the other to describe it as completed and so as perfect" (p. 6).

In the first place, I suppose no one will deny that in a very large proportion, probably a majority, of instances the so-called "Future tense" actually does denote a *future* event. It is not an adequate explanation of this fact to say that the event is "preparing to take place, or developing" (p. 24). There are usually no signs whatever of its occurrence; it is not merely or properly incomplete; it is not yet even *begun*, except in the mind of the writer. Surely the fundamental import of the form in question cannot be so disguised or varied, in this very common use of it, as not to be distinctly recognizable. The attempt to translate the verb, in these exceedingly numerous instances, as an incipient act would be preposterous, and the author accordingly passes over this very important usage with a few general and vague remarks (p. 25); not even illustrating it by a single example! This seems a notable failure at the very threshold of the discussion.

Many of the distinctions made by the author in the subsequent portion of his disquisition are clear and sound, such as the use of the Future for the *Imperative* (§ 23), the *uncertain* (§ 24), the *potential* or *Subjunctive* (§ 24); but there is nothing novel in all this, nor does it at all support his main position. None of these are incipient acts, nor in any legitimate sense incomplete; they are simply contingent or conceptual. In fact, the use of the tense in question as a proper Imperfect, to

* A TREATISE ON THE USE OF THE TENSES IN THE HEBREW. By S. R. Driver, M. A., Fellow of New College. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1884. 12mo, pp. xviii and 356. Price, \$1.95

denote an uncompleted act, is quite rare in Hebrew, and the author himself adduces but few examples (§ 27), nor are they very clear. Most or all of them are more readily explainable on the usual theory of the tense. Perhaps I cannot do better than to examine these very passages, in order to show the fallacy and inadequacy of Mr. Driver's chief point.

In Deut. xxxii., 18, תָּשִׁי is not "*Thou beganst to forget* the Rock that had borne thee," but is a *relative*, dependent upon the preceding Præter (יָלַדְךָ), as the Future following with *vav* conversive shows (וַתִּשְׁכַּח); and the whole should be rendered thus: "A Rock bore thee, *whom* thou neglectest; and thou hast forgotten God thy former." In Job iii., 3, יוֹם אֵלֶּיךָ בּוֹ is not to be rendered "The day *I was being born in*" [sic]; but evidently as a relative clause, "The day on which *I was born*"—(*dies quo natus fuerim*, not *nascerer*, nor *natus fuisset*). In Ps. vii., 16, יִפְעַל is not "The pit *he is* (or *was*) making," but again as a relative clause, "The pit *which he had just made*," for he could not fall into it until it had been completed. In Gen. ii., 10, מִשָּׁם יִפָּרֵד does not mean "from there it *began to divide*," nor in xxxvii., 6, does תִּסְבֶּנָה mean that the other sheaves "*began to move round*" Joseph's; but only that the division and the surrounding were *apparent acts*, the objects "*seemed*" to do so; like the יַעֲלֶה or apparent ascent of the mist, and the other Futures in ii., 5, 6.* In Num. xxiv., 17, to render אֶרְאֶנִּי "*I see him, but not now*," is a clear contradiction in terms. In Jer. vi., 4, יִנְטֹן is not to be rendered "The shadows of evening *are beginning to lengthen*," but "*will (soon) be lengthened*." In like manner, the instances of an alleged *frequentative* use of the Future (p. 32) may more naturally be resolved as acts depending upon the *will* of the parties, and not necessarily repeated.

I conclude that, while the "Future" in Hebrew evidently denotes a *qualified* or dependent act or condition, it does not contain or represent the form of limitation selected by Mr. Driver, namely inchoation or incompleteness.

* This last verb may perhaps be explained on the same principle as the above, namely the equivalent of the Latin rule that *a relative clause requires the Subjunctive* ("There was a mist that went up"); to which however, in Hebrew at least, must be added the proviso that *it is intended to express a subordinate thought*, and not a principal or independent fact. In such cases the subject properly precedes the verb, because the main emphasis is thrown upon the former, and the latter is merely suppletive to the general idea. The relative אֲשֶׁר is suppressed for terseness, as in English, "the money (which) I earned I spent."

THE DIVINE NAMES AS THEY OCCUR IN THE PROPHETS.

BY BARNARD C. TAYLOR,

Professor in Crozer Theological Seminary, Upland, Pa.

In the Book of Isaiah יהוה occurs, as a separate name, 341 times; יהוה צבאות, 60 times; אלהים, 63 times; אל, 14 times; יהוה אלהים, 20 times; אדני, 36 times; יהוה אדני, 15 times; קדש, 25 times; יהוה occurs, in all, 436 times; אלהים and אל, 97 times; אדני, 51 times.

In the Book of Jeremiah יהוה occurs, as a separate name, 574 times; יהוה צבאות, 76 times; יהוה אלהים צבאות, 6 times; אלהים, 52 times; יהוה אלהים, 53 times; אדני, 6 times; אדני יהוה, 8 times; יהוה occurs, in all, 717 times; אלהים, 105 times.

It will be noticed that, in most cases where אלהים occurs in Jeremiah, it is with some suffix, and is in apposition with יהוה.

In the Book of Ezekiel יהוה occurs, as a separate name, 215 times; אדני, 5 times; יהוה אדני, 215 times; אלהים, 37 times; יהוה occurs, in all, 430 times; אדני, 220 times; יהוה צבאות does not occur.

In Hosea יהוה occurs, as a separate name, 44 times; אלהים, 26 times.

In Joel יהוה occurs, as a separate name, 33 times; אלהים, 11 times.

In Amos יהוה occurs, as a separate name, 52 times; אלהים, 3 times; יהוה occurs, in all, 79 times; אלהים, 8 times.

In Obadiah יהוה occurs, in all, 7 times.

In Jonah יהוה occurs, in all, 26 times; אלהים, 13 times.

In Micah יהוה occurs, in all, 36 times; אלהים, 9 times.

In Nahum יהוה occurs 11 times; אלהים, 1 time; יהוה צבאות, 2 times.

In Habakkuk יהוה occurs 13 times; אלהים, 3 times.

In Zephaniah יהוה occurs 34 times; אלהים, 4 times.

In Haggai יהוה occurs 21 times; יהוה צבאות, 14 times; אלהים, 3 times.

In Zechariah יהוה occurs, as a separate name, 79 times; יהוה צבאות, 52 times; אלהים, 11 times; יהוה occurs, in all, 131 times.

In Malachi יהוה occurs, as a separate name, 21 times; יהוה צבאות, 24 times; יהוה occurs, in all, 45 times; אלהים, 6 times.

It will be of interest to compare these results with the use of the names for God in the Psalms, to see if the date of any Psalm can be determined by the name that prevails.

These prophetic writings cover quite completely the period from 880 (cir.) to the close of the 5th century B. C. At least they belong to the periods when Psalms were produced. If these books do not show that there were periods when

one or the other name was exclusively employed (and they do not) it certainly cannot be claimed that the one or the other name occurs in a particular Psalm or collection of Psalms, because that name was the prevailing one at that period.

The predominance of the name יהוה throughout can be accounted for by the fact that this name distinguished God from the idols of other nations. It would be especially appropriate in the mouths of the Prophets in times of idolatry, and of hostilities with other nations.

In Ezekiel the name יהוה צבאות does not occur. He does not speak of God as the warrior, leading his people in their battles. But in his book אדני יהוה occurs 215 times. With him יהוה is the "Lord of all the earth."

It is most natural that, in the poetry of the Psalms, the more general, the more universal name for God, should be more often used. The ideas, the views of the poet, often regarded God as the אלהים, the Mighty, the Adorable One, without further distinction from the idols of the nations.

Without attempting here even to suggest reasons why in some Psalms יהוה prevails, while in others אלהים prevails, it is maintained, in view of the facts given above in reference to the use of the different names in the Prophets, that the reason is not a chronological one. It is not determined by the date of the Psalm.

UNIVERSITY NOTES FROM ABROAD.

BY IRA M. PRICE, M. A.,

Leipzig, Germany.

In the Universities of Germany the following lectures are delivered in the Old Testament and Semitic departments during the present Semester :—

BERLIN: *Dillmann*, 1) Old Testament Introduction, 2) History of the Text of the Old Testament, 3) Psalms. *Kleinert*, Genesis. *Strack*, 1) Job, 2) Proverbs, 3) Hebrew Grammar, with exercises, 4) Institutum Judaicum.—* *Barth*, 1) Arabic Grammar and Chrestomathy of Derenbourg, 2) The Syriac Apocrypha, 3) The Annals of Tabarî, with Introduction to the oldest Arabic historical writings. *Dieterici*, 1) Arabic Grammar, 2) Poems of Mutanabbi with the Commentary of Wahidi, 3) Exposition of “Thier und Mensch.” *Jahn*, 1) Arabic Syntax in Comparison with the other Semitic Languages, especially Hebrew, 2) Arabic Authors. *Sochau*, 1) Syriac Grammar, with Introduction to the Aramaic Dialects, 2) Old Semitic Epigraphy, 3) Arabic Poems of Magaṭṭalijjat, 4) Beidhâwî, 5) Exercises in Reading and Explaining Arabic MSS. *Schrader*, 1) Elements of Assyrian Writing and Language, 2) Reading of selected Assyrian Inscriptions, 3) Grammar of the Chaldee Language and exposition of the same in Daniel and Ezra, 4) Assyrio-Babylonian Archæology. *Erman*, 1) Elements of Egyptian Writings and Language, 2) Coptic Grammar, 3) The neighboring lands of Old Egypt.

BONN: *Kamphausen*, 1) Isaiah, 2) Old Testament Seminar. *Budde*, 1) Old Testament Introduction, 2) Exercises in Hebrew.—*Gildemeister*, 1) Arabic Grammar, Müller’s Caspari, 2) Syriac Reading, 3) Arabic Reading, 4) Hamâza.

BRESLAU: *Räbiger*, 1) Old Testament Introduction, 2) Job, 3) Old Testament Seminar. *Schultz*, 1) Biblical Theology of Old Testament, 2) Prophecies of Isaiah.—*Praetorius*, 1) Hebrew Grammar, 2) Arabic Grammar, 3) Hariri’s Dura, 4) Ethiopic. *Fränkel*, 1) Elements of Syriac, 2) Grammar of Biblical Aramaic, 3) Annals of Tabarî.

ERLANGEN: *Köhler*, 1) Isaiah, 2) Genesis, 3) In Seminar, Ecclesiastes.—*Spiegel*, 1) Arabic Grammar, 2) Modern Persian Grammar.

FREIBURG: *König*, 1) Old Testament Introduction, 2) Biblical Archæology.

GIESSEN: *Stade*, 1) Old Testament Introduction, 2) Isaiah, 3) In Old Testament Seminar, Jeremiah with written productions.

GOETTINGEN: *Bertheau*, 1) Psalms, 2) Old Testament Seminar, 3) Syriac. *Duhm*, 1) Old Testament Introduction, 2) Genesis. *de Lagarde*, 1) Psalms, 2) Syriac or Arabic. *Shultz*, Isaiah.—*Wuestenfeld*, Arabic Grammar.

GREIFSWALD: *Giesebrecht*, 1) Psalms, 2) Minor Prophets. *Meinhold*, Old Testament Introduction.—*Ahlwardt*, 1) Arabic Grammar, 2) Persian Grammar, 3) Muallakât.

HALLE: *Richm.*, 1) History of Text of Old Testament, and the critical and hermeneutical methods pertaining to it, 2) Isaiah I.—xxxix., 3) Introduction to the

* Long dashes stand between Theological and Philosophical Faculties.

- canonical Books of the Old Testament, 4) Old Testament Seminar. *Schlottmann*, 1) Messianic Prophecies of Old Testament, 2) Genesis, 3) Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments, 4) Exegetical Exercises.——*Gosche*, 1) Connection between the Oriental and Occidental Culture, 2) Elements of Arabic compared with Hebrew, 3) Hamâza, 4) History of the literature of Islam.
- HEIDELBERG: *Merx*, 1) Biblical Theology of the Old Testament, 2) Isaiah, 3) Old Testament Seminar. *Kneucker*, Genesis.——*Weil*, 1) Muallakât of Lebid, with exercises in reading Arabic MSS. 2) Exposition of "Thousand and one Nights" with exercises in modern-Arabic conversation, 3) Persian, 4) Gesellschaft devoted to Hebrew, Arabic, Persian and Turkish Languages and Literature. *Eisenlohr*, 1) Egyptian Texts, 2) Topographical description of Egypt.
- JENA: *Hilgenfeld*, Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments. *Siegfried*, 1) Old Testament Introduction, 2) Isaiah, 3) Exercises in Old Testament Seminar. *Schmiedel*, 1) Old Testament Exercises, 2) Elementary Exercises in Hebrew.——*Stickel*, 1) Hebrew Exercises, 2) Chaldee, 3) Syriac, 4) Arabic Grammar and Writings.
- KIEL: *Klostermann*, 1) Job, 2) Minor Prophets, 3) Exercises in Old Testament Seminar. *Baethgen*, 1) Hebrew Exercises, 2) History of the Jews from Cyrus to Hadrian.——*Hoffmann*, 1) Hebrew Syntax, 2) Isaiah, 3) Syriac or Arabic, 4) Modern Persian.
- KOENIGSBERG: *Sommer*, 1) Genesis, 2) Psalms, 3) The political and civil Antiquity of Israel.——*Mueller*, 1) Chaldee Portions of the Old Testament with outlines of Chaldee Grammar, 3) Hebrew Grammar with exercises, 3) Arabic Grammar.
- LEIPZIG: *Delitzsch*, *Franz*, 1) Old Testament Introduction, 2) Genesis, 3) In Prediger-Gesellschaft I., The History in the last of Genesis and first of Exodus, 4) In Institutum Judaicum, Biblical Chaldee and Targum, 5) In Anglo-American Exegetical Gesellschaft, "Volksreligion und Weltreligion" of Kuenen. *Baur*, Pre-exilic Minor Prophets. *Guthe*, 1) Psalms, 2) Topography and History of Jerusalem, 3) Modern Palestine, its inhabitants, religion and culture, 4) In Old Testament Gesellschaft, the most important Messianic Prophecies of the Old Testament. *Ryssel*, 1) Isaiah, 2) Isaiah LIII., and the History of its Interpretation. *König*, 1) Biblical Theology of the Old Testament. 2) In Society of Old Testament Exegesis and Biblical Theology, Interpretation of the Old Testament Passages quoted in the New Testament.——*Fleischer*, The Koran according to Beidhâwi. *Krehl*, 1) Arabic Grammar of Socin, with exercises in translating easy passages, 2) Muallakât, edition of Arnold, 3) Dillmann's Ethiopic Chrestomathy. *Ebers*, 1) The Writings and Grammar of the Language of Egypt, 2) History of the Pharaonic Kingdom down to the conquest of Egypt by Cambyzes. *Delitzsch*, *Frdr.* 1) Koran, 2) Introduction into the whole realm of investigation in the cuneiform inscriptions, together with Inscription of 3d ed. of the "*Assyrische Lesestuecke*," 3) Cursory reading of the Old Testament with a brief explanation of the Books of Kings and Psalms I.-XLI., 4) Persian Grammar, with Interpretation of Gulistan.
- MARBURG: *Graf von Baudissin*, 1) Geography of Palestine, 2) Biblical Theology of Old Testament, 3) In Theological Seminar, Interpretation of Isa. xv. sq.

Cornill, Old Testament Introduction. *Kessler*, 1) Genesis, 2) Chaldee Grammar of Bible and Targum, with reading of Daniel. *Ranke*, Messianic Prophecies of the Prophets.—*Wellhausen*, 1) Elements of Arabic, Socin's Grammar, 2) Syriac, Rödiger's Chrestomathy, 3) Ethiopic, Dillmann's Chrestomathy, 4) Ibn Hisham's Sira interpreted.

MUNICH: *Schönfelder*, 1) Genesis, 2) Old Testament Introduction, 3) Hebrew, with exercises, 4) Syriac, with exercises.—*Hommel*, 1) Continuation of Persian, reading of selected portions of Nizami and Anvari Sohaili, 2) Reading of Muallakât continued, 3) The cultivated plants and domestic animals among the Semitic peoples. *Lauth*, 1) History of Egyptology, 2) The more difficult chapters of the Book of the Dead, 3) Papyrus Anastasi I. *Bezold*, 1) Syriac for beginners, 2) Assyrian, 3) Arabic continued, Houtsma's Ja'qûbî, Part II.

ROSTOCK: *Bachmann*, 1) Isaiah, 2) History of the Old Covenant.—*Phillippi*, 1) Hebrew Grammar, 2) Chaldee portions of the Old Testament and selected portions of the Targum of the Prophets, 3) Arabic Grammar, with exercises in translation.

STRASSBURG: *Nowack*, 1) Genesis, 2) Hebrew Seminar for beginners, 3) Old Testament Seminar. *Reuss*, Selected portions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.—*Duemichen*, 1) Egyptian Grammar, with translation of hieroglyphic Inscriptions, Course I., 2) Selected hieroglyphic and hieratic Texts, Course II., 3) Geography of old Egypt according to the monuments. *Noeldeke*, 1) Arabic for beginners, 2) Ibn Hisham, Life of Mohammed, 3) Mutanabbi, 4) Syriac. *Euting*, 1) Semitic Inscriptions, first half, 2) Oriental Calligraphy.

TUEBINGEN: *Kautzsch*, 1) Biblical Theology of the Old Testament, 2) Job, 3) Kimchi's Mikhlol.—*Socin*, 1) Arabic Authors, 2) Syriac, 3) Genesis.

WUERZBURG: *Scholz*, 1) Minor Prophets, 2) Hebrew Grammar, with exercises in translation.

Perhaps of no less moment or interest may be the Old Testament and Semitic lectures as given in the Universities of Switzerland during the winter. They are as follows:—

BASEL: *Smend*, 1) General and special Introduction into the Old Testament, 2) Prophecies of Isaiah, 3) Old Testament Seminar. *Orelli*, 1) 1 Samuel, 2) Arabic, 3) Old Testament Conservator.

BERNE: *Oettli*, 1) Job, 2) Biblical Theology of the Old Testament, 3) Syriac. *Steck*, Arabic.

GENEVA: *X*, 1) Psalms I.-XLII., 3, 2) Old Testament Introduction, 3) History of the Old Testament Text and critical helps thereto, 4) Hebrew Grammar, 5) Genesis XVI.-XVIII.—*Montet*, 1) Arabic, 2) History of Arabic Literature.

LAUSANNE: *Vuilleumier*, 1) Selected Messianic Passages, 2) Selected Psalms, 3) History of the Text and the most important translations of the Old Testament, 4) Biblical History of the Old Testament, 5) Hebrew Grammar: Weak Verbs, 6) Hebrew Syntax with written exercises, 7) Reading and Interpretation of Judg. XVII.-XVIII., and 1 Sam. IV.-VII.

NEUCHÂTEL: *Ladame*, 1) History of Israel from earliest times down to the establishment of the kingdom, 2) Biblical Archæology, social and religious life of Israel. *Perrochet*, 1) Pentateuch Criticism, 2) 2 Sam. XIV.-XXIV. and Isa. XLIX.-LVII., 3) Hebrew Grammar, 4) Hebrew, reading and exercises.

ZURICH: *Steiner*, 1) Old Testament Introduction, 2) Genesis, 3) Theological Seminar: Exegetical exercises in 1 Sam., 4) Arabic, Course I., 5) Arabic, Course II., Arnold's Chrestomathy. *Egli*, 1) The Alexandrian Version of the Pentateuch, 2) Exercises in Old Testament Interpretation. *Heidenheim*, 1) Biblical Archæology. 2) Syriac.

Compare the two lists given above. The Lectures of the six Universities of Switzerland are certainly few as compared with those of the twenty Universities of Germany. But the variety of subjects treated is almost as great as in Germany. The range of topics, however, does not follow entirely the beaten path of Germany. We find in the Swiss Universities a course of lectures on Pentateuch Criticism, a subject not handled in any German University lecture; also one on History of Israel and another on Biblical History, important and much neglected topics.

The beaten path of exegesis in Germany is very plain from a careful reading of its lectures. The three favorite and principal books almost always appear,—Genesis, Psalms and Isaiah, while now and then Job, Proverbs and the Minor Prophets receive attention. But where are Ezekiel and Jeremiah and Deuteronomy? Jeremiah is treated in *one* Gesellschaft, and some selections of it and Ezekiel are taken up at Strassburg. That is the extent of work on these books represented in lectures. Messianic Prophecy, as such, is treated in two institutions. Biblical Archæology appears just once in German and twice in Swiss institutions. The History of the Text, a sadly neglected subject, appears in two German and in as many Swiss Universities. Old Testament Introduction occupies a large place in both countries, being found in twelve German and three Swiss Universities. Likewise, Old Testament Theology is a large claimant, being found in seven German Universities and but one Swiss institution. Biblical Hermeneutics appears but *once*, and that in Halle in connection with History of text of the Old Testament. Whether the grounds of German exegesis are so firmly established that they need no repairing, or whether the condition of the criticism question has so disarranged the old "order of things" that an attempt to repair at present would not be advisable, does not at once appear. At least, the number of exegetes does not seem to diminish, nor does the appearance of the usual number of new exegetical works wane.

From a careful comparison and study of the lectures as given, one can see exactly the trend of study in Germany, if the lectures represent the work done. But this latter could scarcely be otherwise, as most of the progressive Old Testament workers are members of one or the other University faculties.

For students of the Old Testament will shortly appear in Freiburg, among a lot of theological works: "Old Testament Introduction" by Prof. Budde in Bonn, and "Old Testament Theology" by Prof. Smend in Basel.

In the public library at St. Petersburg there has lately been discovered a manuscript of the Pentateuch with the Arabic translation of Saadia Gaon. It probably belongs to the beginning of the eleventh century.

A few prominent promotions and one change have taken place among the faculties connected with Old Testament and Semitic study.

Dr. Heinrich Thorbecke, Prof. extraordinary of Arabic in Heidelberg, has been called to Halle.

Privatdocent Hommel of Munich has been made Prof. extraordinary, to fill the chair of Oriental Languages and Literature made vacant by the death of Prof. Trumpp.

Dr. Ferd. Mühlau, Prof. ordinary of exegetical Theology in Dorpat, has received the degree of Doctor of Theology from the University of Leipzig.

Privatdocenten Guthe, Ryssel and König have been made Professors extraordinary in the Old Testament department of the Theological faculty of the University of Leipzig.

Dr. Frdr. Delitzsch, Prof. extraordinary of Assyriology, has been made Prof. ordinary honorary, in the University of Leipzig.

Leipzig, December 5th, 1885.

➤CONTRIBUTED NOTES.◀

Qamhi.—In an article in the *HEBRAICA* for October, 1884, I wrote the name of the celebrated grammarian as Qamhi, not Qimhi, basing it upon three MSS. of the **מכלול**, in the *Bibliothèque Imperiale*, in which the name was vocalized **קמחי**, and referring (p. 82, note 2) to the discussion in the London *Athenæum*, of March 22d, 1884. In a "Notiz" in the *Monatsschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, for November, Dr. M. Steinschneider says that he has found the name **קמחי** in Arabic (vol. II. of the Catalogue of Oriental MSS. in the Bodleian Library, p. 568) in the Arabic form **אלקמחי**, and that this is vocalized by Uri and Pusey as *Alcamahi*. Dr. Steinschneider is, however, seemingly unconvinced. At all events, he continues to write the name "Kimchi."

CYRUS ADLER,
Johns Hopkins University.

On Genesis I., 1-3.—A friend has pointed out to me that, in the Note published in *HEBRAICA*, October, 1885, p. 49, I have made no reference to Wellhausen's theory, described in *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (1883) p. 411. In fact, the Note was in substance written before the star of this acute critic had risen upon the horizon. Wellhausen bluntly calls the Ewaldian view of the construction "verzweifelt;" it is certainly out of character with the rest of the narrative. The difficulty about the omission of the article in **בְּרֵאשִׁית** (if we choose to retain that punctuation) does not strike me as a very serious one. (Delitzsch, I observe, renders *ἐν ἀρχῇ* John I., 1, by **בְּרֵאשִׁית**). I have referred already to **מְרֵאשִׁית** in Isa. XLVI., 10. And if this be designated poetry, why is Gen. I. to be called prose? Doubtless in plain narrative style we should expect —**בְּ**, though rather **בְּרֵאשֹׁנָה** than **בְּרֵאשִׁית** (as Dr. A. McCaul long ago observed): the latter indeed might have suggested wrongly that the creation mentioned in the verse was the first in a series of creative acts. Wellhausen's remark, so ingenious, so plausible, in *Geschichte Israels* (1878) I., 399, that the temporal sense of **רֵאשִׁית** is borrowed from Aramaic, has been justly criticized by Prof. Driver (*Journal of Philology*, XI., 232, note), who also maintains,—and he is probably right,—that **ר'** in the temporal sense occurs as early as Hosea (IX., 10). The difference in form between the parallel passages in Wellhausen is very interesting; it shows how carefully he revised his work.

PROF. T. K. CHEYNE,
Oxford, England.

A Prayer in Hebrew.—It occurred to Mr. Benjamin Douglass, of Chicago, one of the Lecturers during the session of the Summer School, that it might stimulate some of the students to the more earnest study of the Holy Tongue if he should offer the usual opening prayer in Hebrew: and he accordingly thought out and spoke the prayer which follows. As a further incitement he has added the accents.

➤EDITORIAL: NOTES.◀

The Study of the Hebrew Vowel-System.—American students have given far too little attention to the Hebrew vowel-system. Until the appearance of Bickell's *Outlines of Hebrew Grammar**, in an English translation and of Davidson's *Elementary Hebrew Grammar*,† there was really nothing in the English language from which one could obtain a clear idea of the relative value of the Hebrew vowel-sounds. Bickell's *Outlines*, however, is too advanced for a beginner, while Davidson's *Elements*, although an elementary treatise, is often obscure and not well arranged. Gesenius' grammar in its present form‡ is perhaps the best in use. With successive editions, however, it has become a conglomerate mass of material,—a mine from which much that is of value may be obtained, but only by digging.

Although Gesenius and Davidson have been studied in America for so many years, the impression produced upon the minds of their students, at least so far as concerns the vowel-system, have been very indefinite. The ordinary student, who has given attention during three years to the Hebrew language, knows almost nothing of the vowel-system. The chief practical result of a greater part of the Hebrew instruction given in this country, has been to create the feeling that the vowel-signs and points of the Hebrew Bible are a complete jumble; and consequently the mass of our students, discouraged and hopeless, have thrown aside the study, although a sufficient amount of time had been devoted to it to enable them to master the language.

Many students, and not a few teachers, have endeavored to justify their neglect of this important part of the work upon the ground that the vowel-system, as we have it, is wholly the work of the Massorites, and is uncertain, artificial, arbitrary. We may remark briefly:—

1. However unreliable the Massoretic system may be in its application to given words, as between two or more pointings for that word, the particular pointing in question is consistent with the general laws of the vowel-system. E. g., the Massorites may have pointed the consonants רָבַר, רִבֵּר, when it should have been רִבֵּר, or רָבַר, or רִבֵּר; but their mistake, if it is a mistake, is one of interpretation, not necessarily one of grammatical form. So far as the language is concerned, any one of these forms is, in itself, correct. The pointing was in no sense an arbitrary one. They may have been entirely wrong in their division of

* *OUTLINES OF HEBREW GRAMMAR*, by Gustavus Bickell, D. D., Professor of Theology at Innsbruck, revised by the author, and annotated by the translator, Samuel Ives Curtiss, Jr. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.. 1877.

† *AN INTRODUCTORY HEBREW GRAMMAR* with progressive exercises in Reading and Writing. By A. B. Davidson, M. A., LL. D., Prof. of Hebrew, etc., in the New College Edinburgh. 7th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1885.

‡ That is, the last edition issued under Prof. Edward C. Mitchell, D. D., published (in 1884) by W. F. Draper, Andover. Not all Hebrew students in this country seem to be aware of the fact that in this edition pp. 203-210 are entirely new pages. The treatment of noun-formation here given us is vastly superior to the old treatment.

words and in their choice of vowel-points, but a hundred thousand such mistakes would not in the least affect the scientific value of the vowel-points in reproducing the words as they were spoken. However corrupt, therefore, the results of scientific research may show the Massoretic *text* to be, the Massoretic *system* of punctuation, as a system, will remain, in general, *untouched*.

2. The Massoretic vowel-system is the starting-point. He who would learn Hebrew must master the principles in accordance with which this system is used. When one comes to look into it he finds, instead of confusion, the most wonderful order; instead of arbitrariness, the most marked scientific regularity. The study of the system soon reduces itself to the study of phonetics, and the laws of human speech which hold good every-where. The beginner soon discovers that a given original sound, placed under certain conditions, suffers certain changes. The study of the Hebrew vowel-system becomes, in short, a mathematical study. It is no longer a matter of memory, but a thing to be reasoned out. Is it not worth our while, in view of this, to teach and to study the vowel-system until we shall have mastered it, in its details and in the great principles which regulate these details? Here, and only here, is the basis for all efficient work in the study of Hebrew.

WILLIAM R. HARPER.

To Hebrew Students.—The constituency of **HEBRAICA** includes two classes: 1) Hebrew professors and scholars; 2) Hebrew students. For the latter class, which includes a large number of persons who are endeavoring, in the midst of other pressing duties, to acquire a living knowledge of Hebrew, this note is written.

HEBRAICA is intended to furnish help to you as well as to those who have become professional scholars. The managing editor acknowledges, however, that the Journal has not in the past furnished altogether that kind of material from which you could gain most profit. Scholars write, more easily, for scholars than for students. The present number, containing, as it does, a fair proportion of both kinds of articles, will serve, it is hoped, as a stepping-stone to future numbers which we shall try to make even more satisfactory to you.

In this number the *student*, as distinguished from the scholar, even if he has been a student for but a short time, will surely find much that is of interest in the articles of Professor Briggs, Dr. Ward, and Professor Haupt; while in the shorter articles and notes, particularly in Professor Gardiner's suggestions, Prof. Taylor's resumé, Prof. Brown's note on **שְׁמִי**, and in the Hebrew prayer of Mr. Douglass, a large portion of which will be found quite familiar, there is valuable and stimulating matter for those even who are beginners. The attention of *students* is especially invited to the notice of Prof. Strack's new Hebrew grammar.

Matters stand thus. Unless the *students* of Hebrew will aid in supporting **HEBRAICA**, and their aid cannot be expected if the Journal does not contain material which will help them, the Journal cannot continue. It is a sad fact, yet a true one, that America has not a sufficient number of Semitic *scholars* to support a distinctively linguistic journal. We trust, therefore, that in our effort, the *students* will render excellent aid. In turn, we shall do every thing possible to repay them for their sympathy and co-operation.

WILLIAM R. HARPER.

➤BOOK ❖ NOTICES.❖➤

[Any publication noticed in these pages may be obtained of the AMERICAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF HEBREW, Morgan Park, Ill.]

A CRITICISM OF DRIVER'S HEBREW TENSES.*

This brochure is from the pen of a layman, a gentleman who, amid the demands of large business interests, has made the study of Hebrew and of prophecy the employment of his leisure, and has acquired a very wide knowledge of his subjects.

Mr. Douglass is among those who hold that the primary distinction of the Hebrew tenses is that of past and present time, and not of complete and incomplete action, as is maintained by a discussion of the passages used by Driver in illustrating the use of the tenses as he holds them. It is held that the frequentative use of the Future (Imperfect) expresses the use of the tenses in many of the cases where it has been rendered by a simple past.

F. J. GURNEY.

AN UNPOINTED TEXT OF GENESIS.†

Many teachers have felt the need of an unpointed text of at least one book of the Old Testament. Genesis, being the Hebrew "first reader," may be most appropriately chosen for this purpose. To one who has not practised reading the unpointed text, the work may seem unimportant, and the results of small consequence. There is, however, no better way of teaching Hebrew grammar, no better way of teaching the language, than to require of the student the pronunciation of the Massoretic text, with only the unpointed text before his eyes. Professor Haupt's suggestion in this number (p. 99) that difficult words be pointed, or partially pointed, is a good one. The book has no distinctive features. The type is good; the paper, fair. It is especially a class-room book.

WILLIAM R. HARPER.

THE EARLY CHAPTERS OF GENESIS.‡

The discussion in Old Testament criticism started by Wellhausen's *Geschichte Israels* is still carried on in Germany, and the interest in the Pentateuch shows no sign of abatement. If any one topic might seem to be worn threadbare, it would be the composition of the Book of Genesis, especially its early chapters; for these chapters have been more closely scrutinized than others, be-

* A LETTER TO PROFESSORS, SCHOLARS, AND FRIENDS OF THE HOLY TONGUE; criticising Driver's *Hebrew Tenses*, etc. By Benjamin Douglass. Chicago: Published by the author, 1885. Pp. 12.

* LIBER GENESIS. Sine punctis exscriptus. Curaverunt Ferdinandus Muehlau, et Aemilius Kautzsch, editio altera. Lipsiae; impensis Joannis Ambrosii Barth. 1885. Pp. 78. M. 1.80.

* DIE BIBLISCHE URGESCHICHTE (Gen. i.-xii., 5) untersucht von Lic. Karl Budde. Giessen 1883. Pages xii and 539, 8vo.

cause they, more than almost any others, show the distinct phenomena on which the documentary hypothesis is based. Nevertheless, the volume before us shows that these chapters still afford a field for new and ingenious speculation, if nothing more. The present reviewer confesses that he took up the book with the impression that it could not say any thing new, and at the same time valuable, on its theme. In this he has been agreeably disappointed; and while the minuteness of the analysis often leads one to question its certainty, there is much in the book that is not only interesting but profitable.

The problems of Old Testament criticism are two,—first, to separate as clearly as possible the different documents; secondly, to determine their relation in general, and their order of time in particular. All who concede the right of literary analysis of the Pentateuch must admit further discussion of both these problems. Whatever danger to the “views commonly received among us” arises from such analysis can hardly be greater for one succession of documents (for one order of time, that is) than for another. Professor Budde argues for the later date of the Elohist (A of Dillman, Q of Wellhausen). That fact, in itself, does not render his book more suspicious than Dillmann’s (for example) who prefers the reverse order.

Instead of giving a running commentary on this section of Genesis, our author gives us twelve topical discussions, with the following titles: (1) the Marriages of the Sons of God, (2) the Tree of Life, (3) the Sethite Genealogy, (4) the Cainite Genealogy, (5) Jahvistic Fragments in the Sethite Genealogy, (6) Cain’s Fratricide, (7) Conclusion of this section, (8) the Flood, (9) Noah and Canaan, (10) Babel and Nimrod, (11) Home and Migration of Abraham, (12) Relation of the Documents to each other. In the whole inquiry, his eye is mainly directed to the Jehovistic document, on the supposition that the Elohist narrative is already tolerably well settled. As an appendix, he gives the Hebrew Text of the oldest part of the Jehovistic document (J¹ he calls it, with Wellhausen), as he supposes himself able to restore it. It includes Gen. II., 4b, to IV., 2; IV., 16-24; VI., 1-4; X., 9; XI., 1-9; IX., 20-27, arranged in this order; and the author proposes to transfer the difficult verse VI., 3 from its present location, inserting it after III., 21.

The analysis can hardly count on universal acceptance, in the present divided state of opinion. No one, however, can follow the investigation without feeling that the author has carefully studied his text, with an earnest desire to solve the literary problem it presents. Many of his observations are of real value, aside from his critical theory. For example, the following on the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil:

“It is constantly made evident how heaven-wide the biblical narratives (steeped as they are in Israel’s knowledge of God) are removed from the myths of Assyria, however like they may superficially seem to be. . . . The Tree of Life is found among many peoples. . . . and we may believe that it occurs in the Assyrian literature. But the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil has never yet been discovered there, and we may well believe that it never will be discovered. The cylinder published in Smith’s *Chaldean Genesis*, and now in Delitzsch’s *Wo lag das Paradies*, may be briefly examined here.”

The description and argument that follow are too long to quote. They show convincingly that there is no evidence for the identification of the Assyrian tree with the biblical; and the conclusion is that the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil is original to the biblical account; and this means that the biblical account is distinguished by the *ethical* element.

The author's exegesis seems in general sound, and his occasional proposals to alter the text are called forth by real difficulties. He supposes, for example, that the verse Gen. VI., 7, is corrupt. It now reads, "And Jehovah said: I will wipe out man which I have created from the face of the ground, *from man to cattle, to reptile and to bird of the heavens*; for I repent that I made them." The words in italics are not in accordance with the rest of the verse. They are probably not a part of the original narrative therefore.

Another difficult verse is Gen. IX., 26, though the difficulty is of another kind. We now read:

"And he said: Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants may he be to his brethren.

And he said: Blessed be Jehovah God of Shem, and Canaan shall be servant to him.

May God prosper Japhet, and may he dwell in the tents of Shem, and may Canaan be servant to him."

The grammar seems to be right, but the thought is not so clear. In the first place we expect Shem, the ancestor of Israel, to receive a blessing, but he receives none. In the second member we read only "Blessed be Jehovah." In this same verse, "Canaan shall be servant to him" would naturally mean Canaan shall be servant to Jehovah, who is the main subject. In view of these facts, Dr. Budde proposes to omit one word, and with a slight change of pointing to read:

"The Blessed of Jehovah is Shem,
And let Canaan be servant to him."

This would certainly meet all the requirements, and may be called at least plausible.

Enough has been said to prove our assertion that there is room for new and ingenious speculation in the territory under discussion. That the ingenuity is sometimes too ingenious will be readily discovered. The paragraph (p. 184 sq.) in which our author accounts for the story of Cain's fratricide is a striking example. Readers will, therefore, exercise a healthy scepticism in regard to many passages; and such a scepticism is what the author himself would desire. He himself exercises it in regard to many assertions of his teacher Wellhausen. He declines, for example, to accept Wellhausen's hypothesis that the original narrative of the Creation made God's work cover seven days, leaving no Sabbath. So with the current tendency to derive the primeval history of the Bible from Assyrian (Assyro-Babylonian) sources. We have already noted one example of this in regard to the Tree of Knowledge. Another concerns the first chapter of Genesis, in regard to which he decidedly rejects "the neck-breaking conjecture that the biblical account was borrowed [from the Babylonians] during the Exile" (p. 292).

Dr. Budde closes his book with a protest against the accusation that the Higher Criticism aims at "a barren naturalistic construction of history, arranged according to the principles of an infidel philosophy which allows the possibility of raw evolution processes only." For his own part, he adds "that the results of this inquiry cannot harm the Christian faith is my firm conviction, because I have not dropped 'the anchor of my faith and hope in the sandy shallows of theory' or of any traditional view of the *aetas patriarchalis et Mosaica*, but have learned, and am minded to cast it elsewhere." "The Revelation of God in Israel shows itself in our inquiry at every step... in the purifying power which Israel's knowledge of God demonstrates on all the material which is appropriated thereby."

PROF. H. P. SMITH,

Cincinnati, O.

PROFESSOR STRACK'S HEBREW GRAMMAR.*

A review of the *Porta Linguarum Orientalium*, published in *The Hebrew Student*, Vol. II., pp. 126, 127, closed with these words: "These hand-books have received deservedly the highest commendations of linguistic critics. They supply a demand which exists and which is all the while increasing. Our only wish is that a translation of these, or a similar series, might be published in English." With this we compare the publisher's announcement: "To meet many wishes, the parts which appear from the year 1885 either altogether new, or in a new edition, will be published at the same time in two languages, German and English, or German and Latin, the Latin being employed only in special cases."

Thus far only two English versions have appeared: (1) an Arabic Grammar, from the pen of one of the greatest living Arabic authorities, Professor A. Socin, and (2) the Hebrew Grammar of Professor H. L. Strack, which lies before us. The series was at first edited by Prof. J. H. Petermann (died in 1876), but is now under the editorial charge of Prof. Strack.

The grammar is intended for students wishing to prepare themselves in the shortest possible time for attendance upon the easier exegetical lectures.

The peculiar features of the volume are (1) the taking of the vocabulary from Genesis and the Psalms; (2) the allowing in the grammar only those forms which actually occur in the Bible; (3) the transcribing in italics of hypothetical forms adduced to explain the origin of forms in use, and (4) the peculiar arrangement of the paradigms of weak verbs in order to prevent a mechanical learning by rote. These features must certainly commend themselves to students. The great bane of grammatical study is the mechanical memorizing of a paradigm.

Besides the grammar proper (pp. 1-150) there are 67 pp. of paradigms, literature and exercises. The "literature" is very valuable.

While the treatment accorded the various points as they come up is, of necessity, very brief, it is surprising to see that so much material of an advanced character, fundamental in its nature, could have been included in so small a space. Many interesting statements occur which one does not meet in the grammars ordinarily used. We refer briefly to a few of these statements which will be of interest to many who do not have access to the book:

1) זֶרַע is also used to indicate the open *e*-sound *è* or *â* arising by vocalic modification (*Umlautung*) out of *a*, e. g., זֶרַע *zèra'* (from *zar'*, § 28*d*), רֵאֵנָה *r'è'nā* (§ 74*g*).

2) Instead of the long and involved statement concerning the occurrence of ־ at the end of a word, generally in use, Prof. Strack sums up the matter by saying that it occurs at the end of a word "when the word ends in ך or in two consonants."

3) Syllables are (*a*) open, (*b*) shut, (*c*) *opened* (i. e., syllables whose originally double close has been removed by a helping vowel), (*d*) *loosely shut* (i. e., those which were originally followed by a vowel which has been dropped). Examples of *opened* syllables are קִדָּשׁ and all Segholates, נֶעֱרַר (= *nă^a-rô*); of *loosely shut*

* PORTA LINGUARUM ORIENTALIU: HEBREW GRAMMAR with Exercises, Literature and Vocabulary, by Hermann L. Strack, Ph. D., D. D., Professor Extraordinarius of Theology in Berlin. Translated from the Second German Edition. Karlsruhe and Leipzig: H. Reuther. New York: B. Westermann & Co. 1885. Pp. 150, 67.

syllables, the first in כַּנְפִּיהֶם (kän-phê-hëm), the S'wâ under נ being treated as *silent*. Professor Strack's theory of the syllable was published, in detail, in *HEBRAICA*, Vol. I., pp. 73-75.

4) The D. l. in שְׂתִים is explained on the ground that the punctuation presupposed the pronunciation *ěštāyīm*.

5) When the Hē Interrogative is written ה before gutturals, the guttural is said to have D. f. implied.

6) The Inseparable prepositions before מֵה are said to be pointed with Pāthāḥ and D. f., as in לִמָּה, בְּמָה.

7) Section 46 B., on the use of Waw Conjunctive, is especially good, though of course condensed.

8) Instead of "tenses," the word "moods" is used, as being a more suitable term. The terms "Perfect" and "Imperfect" are used rather than "Past" and "Future." "Voice" is used instead of "stem," "species," "conjugation."

9) "The Hebrew verb had its origin in the combination of a noun with the personal pronoun." "The different position of the pronoun (at the end of the Perfect, at the beginning of the Imperfect), is easily intelligible, psychologically; in the completed action we are more particularly interested in the fact; in an action which is not yet completed, we take more interest in the person of the agent."

10) Verbs Middle E and O are termed respectively "verbs with simple intransitive vocalization," and "verbs with strong intransitive vocalization." The passive is indicated (in Pū'āl and Hōph'āl) by the "dark vowel (ū or ō)."

11) The î of the Hīph. Impf., Inf. and Part., is thought to be lengthened from an original ĭ after the analogy of the vowel in יָקִים; while the î of the Hīph. Perf. is thought to have arisen through the influence of that of the Impf. The ĭ of יָעֵ Hīph'il is said to be completely thrust out by the heterogeneous î.

12) The change of ä to é is called (p. 5) a vocalic modification, on p. 114, a half-lengthening (*umlautung*). The peculiar character of this é, as distinct from ě, is thus clearly recognized.

13) Baer's policy of inserting D. l. in consonants other than aspirates is criticized as indefensible and, as carried out, inconsistent. The repetition by Baer of the accents S'ghōltā, Zārqa and the T'lisās is claimed to be without authority. Instead of Q'rî, Q'rê is used as the only correct form.

These are only a few of the items of peculiar interest to which we might call attention. The book is exceedingly free from error. While not all the views presented are entirely acceptable, we find very much that is new and, at the same time, well taken. A few of the questions which have suggested themselves are these: Why is the letter *j* used every-where, in a book for English readers, to represent ' ? Could not a more judicious use of italic type, e. g., in the printing of the English equivalents of Hebrew phrases have been used to advantage? Why is the spelling "genetive" adopted throughout? Is not the change of ĭ to ē or of ŭ to ō better expressed by the term "heighten" than by the indefinite term "lengthen" which applies more particularly to the change of ĭ to î or of ŭ to û? When a full vowel becomes Š'wâ (vocal) is it, strictly speaking, (p. 20) *dropped*? If there is still a sound, is it not merely the change from one sound to another? Not shortening, but volatilization? Is it best to regard אַחֲר occurring before מֵן

as a real construct? Even in an elementary treatise, should not the old and ridiculous doctrine of a *union-vowel* be discarded? Is the *e* of the P'rēl (sometimes), H'ph., H'ph. and H'ithp. Inf. abs., ē or ê?

In this work, Dr. Strack has given an indication of the Hebrew learning for which he is so well-known, not only in Europe, but also in America. But more than this, he has indicated his ability as a practical teacher. The book is fresh, vigorous, scientific. There is no student of Hebrew who would not receive great profit from a thorough reading of it. It is a mistake to confine our work to any one grammar. Every author will throw new light on some points. For this work, as well as for the other important services of Prof. Strack, all biblical students are greatly indebted to him.

WILLIAM R. HARPER.

◀SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.▶

- ABARBANEL, ISAAC. Le principe de la foi, ou la discussion des croyances fondamentales du judaïsme. Traduit par M. le grand rabbin Mossé. Avignon: Gros. 8vo, pp. iii, 235.....10 fr.
- ADAMY, R. Architektonik d. muhamedanischen u. romanischen Stils. 1. Hälfte. Hannover: *Helwing*.....M.6
- ALLEN, F. D. Greek and Latin Inscriptions from Palestine. *American Journal of Philology*, VI., 2, '85, pp. 190-216.
- Ancient Arabian Poetry, chiefly præ-Islamic. Translations, with an Introduction and Notes, by Charles Jas. Lyall. London: *Williams & Norgate*. Fcap. 4to.....10s. 6d.
- A School of Oriental Studies at Oxford. *Academy*, Dec. 26, '85.
- BACHER, WILH. Die hebräisch-neuhebräische u. hebräisch-aramäische Sprachvergleichung d. Abulwalid Merwân Ibn Ganâh. Wien: *Gerold's Sohn*. Lex.-8vo, 40 S.....M.0.60
- BENAMOZEGH, E. Israel et humanité. Démonstration de cosmopolitisme dans les dogmes, les lois, le culte, la vocation, l'histoire et l'idéal de l'hébraïsme. Introduction. Livourne: *chez l'auteur*. 8vo. pp. 75.
- Bibliothek, assyriologische, hrsg. v. F. Delitzsch u. P. Haupt. VI. Babylonische Busspsalmen. Umschrieben, übers. u. erklärt v. H. Zimmern. Leipzig: *Hinrichs*.....M.30
- BROWN, FRANCIS. The Wolfe Exploring Expedition to Babylonia. *Presbyterian Review*, Jan., '86.
- BRUGSCH, H., et J. DUEMICHEN. Recueil de monuments égyptiens. 6 Partie. Leipzig: *Hinrichs*.....M.60
- CAVEN, WILLIAM. The Revised Version of the Bible as a whole. *Presbyterian Review*, Jan., '86.
- Das tironische Psalterium der Wolfenbütteler Bibliothek. *Indep.*, Dec. 17, '85.
- DELITZSCH, FRIEDR. Assyr. Notizen zum Alten Testament IV. Das Schwertlied Ezech. XXI., 13-22. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforsch.*, Nov., '85.
- DEUTSCH, H. Die Sprüche Salomo's, nach der Auffassung im Talmud u. Midrasch dargestellt u. kritisch untersucht. 1. Thl.: Einleitendes. Berlin: *Mampe*. Large 8vo, pp. 108.....M.1.50
- DIETERICI, F. Die Abhandlungen der Ichwân Es-Safâ in Auswahl. Zum ersten Mal aus arab. Handschriften hrsg. 3. Hft. Leipzig: *Hinrichs*.....M.8
- DOUGLASS, BENJAMIN. A Letter to Professors, Scholars and Friends of the Holy Tongue, criticizing "Driver's Hebrew Tenses." Chicago: Published by the author. 12mo, paper, pp. 12.
- DRACHMAN, B. Die Stellung u. Bedeutung des Jehuda Hajjug in der Geschichte der hebräischen Grammatik. Inaug.-Diss. [Heidelberg.] Breslau. 8vo, pp. 80.
- EUTING, JULIUS. Nabatäische Inschriften aus Arabien. Twenty-nine Photogr. Plates. Berlin: *Reimer*. London: *Williams & Norgate*. Boards, 4to...21s.
- FRIEDRICH, PAUL. Die hebräischen Conditionalsätze. Inaugural-Dissertation. Leipzig: *Fock*. Large 8vo... M.1.50

- HARPER, WM. R. Elements of Hebrew by an Inductive Method. *Independent*, Dec. 31, '85.
- HORN, PAUL. Die Nominalflexion im Avesta u. den altpersischen Keilinschriften. 1. Thl.: Die Stämme auf Spiranten. Inaugural-Dissertation. Leipzig: *Stauffer*. Large 8vo.....M.1
- JAPHET, J. M. Hebräische Sprachlehre m. praktischen Aufgaben. 1. Abthlg., nebst e. Vorkursus u. Vocabularium. 5., sehr verb. u. verm. Aufl. Frankfurt-a.-M.: *Kauffmann*. Large 8vo.....M.1.30
- JENNINGS, A. C., LOWE, W. H. The Revised Version of the Old Testament. A Critical Estimate. Conclusion. *Expositor*, Dec., '85.
- JENSEN, P. II Rawl. 51, b, 1-31. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforschg.*, Nov., '85.
- KARPELES, G. Geschichte der jüdischen Literatur. (In 15 Lfgn.) 1. Lfg. Berlin: *Oppenheim*. Large 8vo, pp. 64.....M.1
- KIHN, H., u. D. SCHILLING. Praktische Methode zur Erlernung d. hebräischen Sprache. Grammatik m. Uebungsstücken, Anthologie und Wortregister f. Gymnasien u. theolog. Lehranstalten. Tübingen: *Laupp*. Large 8vo, ..M.2
- LATRILLE, JÖH. Der Nabonidecylinder V Rawl. 64 umschrieben, übersetzt und erklärt II. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforschg.*, Nov., '85.
- LEHMANN, C. F. Der babylonische Königsname Saosduchin. *Ibid.*
- Le Talmud de Jérusalem traduit pour la première fois par M. Schwab. Tome VIII. Traités Kethouboth, Nedarim, Guittin. Paris: *Maisonneuve et Leclerc*. 8vo, pp. iv, 30010 fr.
- Literatur-Blatt für Orientalische Philologie. II. Band, No. 4. Leipzig: *Otto Schulze*. Per volume of four numbers.....M.15
- Pentateuchus Samaritanus. Edidit, etc., H. Petermann. Fasc. 4. Numeri. Ex rec. C. Vollers. Berlin: *Mooser*.....M.15
- PINCHES, THEO. G. Two Texts from Sippara of the Sungod; Additions and Corrections to the Fifth Volume of the Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia V. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforschg.*, Nov., '85.
- RAHMER, M. Hebräisches Gebetbüchlein f. die israelitische Jugend. Frankfurt-a.-M.: *Kauffmann*. 8vo, pp. 44.....M.0.65
- ROSENTHAL, F. Vier apokryphische Bücher aus der Zeit und Schule R. Akiba's. Leipzig: *O. Schulze*. Large 8vo, pp. ix, 150.....M.4
- SCHRADER, EB. Die Keilinschriften am Eingange der Quellgrotte d. Sebeneh-Zu. Mit 1 (Lichtdr.-) Taf. Berlin: *Dümmeler*. Gr. 4.....M.3
- SCHRADER, EB. Die Namen Hadad, Hadadezer, Benhadad u. ihre keilinschriftlichen Aequivalente. *Ztschr. f. Keilschriftforschg.*, Nov., '85.
- STRACK, H. L. Hebräische Grammatik mit Uebungsstücken, Litteratur und Vokabular. 2. Aufl. Karlsruhe: *Reuther*. 8vo.....M.3
- Tanchuma ben Rabbi Abba, Midrasch Tanchuma. Ein agadischer Commentar zum Pentateuch. Hrsg. v. S. Buber, Wilna.....M.9
- The Talmud of Jerusalem. Translated, for the first time into English, by Dr. Moses Schwab, of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Vol. I. The Treatise of Berakhoth (Blessings). London: *Williams & Norgate*. Fcap. 4to.....9s.
- VIGOUROUX, F. Die Bibel u. d. neueren Entdeckungen in Palästina, in Aegypten u. in Assyrien. II. Bd. Mainz: *Kirchheim*. 8vo, pp. 544.....M.6.60
- WUENSCHKE, AUG. Der babylonische Talmud in seinen haggadischen Bestandtheilen. Wortgetreu übersetzt u. durch Noten erläutert. Leipzig: *O. Schulze*. Large 8vo, pp. xvi, 552.....M.11